BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 08654 419 2

No. 7592.160

GIVEN BY

Rev. Robt. J. Johnsons.

SECTARIAN SCHOOL-BOOKS

A SERIES OF LETTERS

7592.160

BY THE

REV. ROBERT J. JOHNSON

AND THE

REV. GEORGE W. COOKE

BOSTON
ALFRED MUDGE & SON, PRINTERS
No. 24 Franklin Street
1889

SECTARIAN SCHOOL-BOOKS

A SERIES OF LETTERS

BY THE

REV. ROBERT J. JOHNSON

AND THE

REV. GEORGE W. COOKE

BOSTON

ALFRED MUDGE & SON, PRINTERS

No. 24 Franklin Street

1889

Rev. Robert F. Johnson,
May 7, 1901

PUBLIC LIBRARY
OF THE
CITY OF BOSTON

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

THE letters reprinted in this pamphlet originally appeared in the Dedham *Standard*, beginning in the issue of that paper dated Nov. 24, 1888, and closing in its issue of April 13, 1889.

It was not my intention to republish them in this form when they were written, and I only do so at the solicitation of friends who are desirous that the whole correspondence shall be submitted to the general public. They were written hurriedly, and as usual haste made waste, so that the reader will find in them some repetitions and digressions, besides other imperfections that have necessarily attended so long and desultory a correspondence. In these apologetic words I speak, of course, only for my own contributions.

With only a few corrections of obvious slips of the pen, or errors of the types, I have reprinted them as they appeared in the columns of the *Standard*. I have also added a number of foot-notes.

It is proper that I should here disclaim any original research as to the facts and authorities used, or even as to the arguments employed in my letters. The charges brought by my opponent, Rev. Mr. Cooke, against the Catholic Church, are all of very ancient origin, and the answers to them are equally historic. Mr. Cooke has invented no calumny of Catholic doctrine, teaching, or practice, which has not been uttered a thousand times before; most of the calumnies that he repeats, indeed, are more than three centuries old. It follows that I could not hope to find anything original to say in exposing them. They had all been exposed and refuted

times without number by others, and I could do little, therefore, but repeat what had been often and better said before.

I ought also to say here that in these letters I do not claim to have explained the doctrine of indulgences fully, nor indeed any further than was necessary to make clear Mr. Cooke's misconceptions and misrepresentations of that doctrine. The Catholic doctrine of indulgences is, therefore, only treated of in a partial and fragmentary manner. Indeed, the entire correspondence is of a disjointed and discursive character; but for this I am not responsible. I followed where my opponent chose to lead, and my lines of reply have been, of necessity, as irregular and eccentric as his lines of attack. Thus more ground has been skimmed over in these letters than has been effectually covered. My opponent has steadily refused to concentrate his argument either upon the point originally at issue or upon any other point subsequently raised, and in attempting to follow his truant lead I have been forced into the same scattering style of pursuit. Nor do I even now claim to have answered all the vague charges, which, as side issues of utter irrelevancy to the main question touching Swinton's text-book and the Catholic objections thereto, Rev. Mr. Cooke has impertinently dragged in. Life is too short, and time and type are too valuable for that.

In his last letter, published in the *Standard* of April 13, Mr. Cooke pays me the unexpected compliment of saying that the style and manner in which I have treated his diatribes against the Catholic Church and her doctrines "make it undesirable that he should reply." I have heard the same opinion expressed by others who have attentively followed the controversy. But I had not supposed it possible for a realizing sense of his own discomfiture to penetrate the consciousness of my opponent.

It is, indeed, most "undesirable" that he should reply. His is eminently a case for the friendly shelter of silence. He has spoken enough already. He cannot extricate himself from the web that he has spun, — of falsified history, mutilated quotations, misunderstood and misapplied extracts from Catholic writers, manufactured excerpts from Catholic magazines, and borrowed calumniations of the Catholic faith. Mr. Cooke has practically acknowledged this to be the case, for it is now five months since I challenged him (in my letter to the *Standard* of April 13) to produce any Encyclical or any other document issued by the Pope, containing the words which Mr. Cooke has put into his mouth, and invited him to publish the same, when found, in the *Standard*, at advertising rates, and at my expense. I gave him the same invitation respecting his pretended quotations from the *Catholic World*, the *Catholic Review*, and Cardinal Antonelli. Ample time has elapsed in which these challenges might have been taken up by Mr. Cooke and his quotations verified at my cost, if verification were possible; but they have not been taken up, for the excellent reason that their verification is impossible. It is manifestly "undesirable" that he should attempt any reply under the circumstances. The old adage fits his situation exactly — "the least said the soonest mended."

And yet Mr. Cooke's recognition of the fact that it is extremely "undesirable" for him to reply does not restrain him from indulging in a few farewell flings, — further argument he has none to offer. It is evidently a humiliation to him to have the reader's attention directed to Mr. Mead's pamphlet, and to be exposed in the act of appropriating that writer's data fills him with irritation. Therefore he wishes to have it understood that his "article on the parochial schools and what is taught in them was not taken from Mr. Mead's pamphlet," while he is fain to confess that he did read the

pamphlet, and that it "did undoubtedly suggest several points of which I (he) made use in my (his) article." Quite so! That is exactly as I supposed. I may note in passing that Mr. Mead, in his pamphlet, has much to say to the credit and praise of the Catholic Church and of parochial schools, and it is strange that so close a perusal of its pages as that which Mr. Cooke evidently gave should have suggested hardly anything which he could use except in a derogatory, depreciative, and hostile spirit towards Catholic teaching and practices.

Those who have perused Mr. Mead's pamphlet do not need me to tell them that not only a great part of what Mr. Cooke has written about parochial school books, but also much of the other matter out of which he has compiled his mosaic letters, including extracts from encyclopedias and other authorities, is to be found in that pamphlet.

My opponent is very sensitive, too, concerning the charge that he garbled his quotations from Maurel's book on indulgences. He insists that he quoted "with great care, word for word, nearly a column of the *Standard*, from that book." He certainly did quote it "with great care"; but his great care was so to quote it as to convey an exactly contrary meaning to that which its author intended and expressed. It is not true that he quoted it "word for word." On the contrary he quoted some words, omitted to quote other words, and strung together the words which he elected to quote in such order and relation that the actual statements of Maurel were completely perverted. In my letter of Feb. 9, I showed exactly where and how, and with what manifest intent to garble and distort, Mr. Cooke had broken in upon Maurel's sentences at comma points, cutting them in two in the middle, and using that part of them which, severed violently from the other parts, reversed their meaning. His aim was to represent Maurel as saying that indulgences were things bought and

sold for money. Maurel's actual declarations are, as I showed in my letter of Feb. 9, most emphatically to the contrary of this proposition.

Maurel insists again and again, in terms as strong as the language affords, that indulgences can never be granted except where sin has first been the subject of sincere repentance and contrition, and has been forgiven; and that even then indulgences only apply to the temporal punishment due to sin.

In spite of all this, Mr. Cooke so dexterously manipulated Maurel's text, omitting a half sentence here, dropping out a whole sentence there, and skipping whole paragraphs which were essential to the author's meaning, that the reader was led to suppose that this Catholic author fully sustained Swinton's slander, namely, that indulgences were bought and sold for money by the authority of the Church, and were actual pardons of guilt, by which the purchaser became free from all his sins. And now, convicted of this unscrupulous misquotation, Mr. Cooke declares that he "quoted with great care." What sort of care was it that made Maurel seem to say the very reverse of what he really says? "Great care," indeed! Great effrontery is the better word.

In the same vein of hardihood my opponent undertakes to justify his treatment of Vicar-General Byrne. Space, he says, did not permit him to quote the whole of the Vicar-General's sermon and interview, as he would have been glad to do. Possibly, but no more space was required for him to quote Vicar-General Byrne truly and justly than to quote him as he did, falsely and unjustly. In my letter to the *Standard* of March 2, I exposed his misquotation of the Vicar-General, and I need not go over the ground again. It is enough here to remind the reader that Mr. Cooke cited the three last lines of an interview with Vicar-General Byrne in the Boston *Globe*, separating these from all that went before.

Thus unfairly quoted, the Vicar-General was made to appear as saying that Swinton had not misrepresented the Catholic Church. Yet within ten lines before the three lines thus abruptly severed from their connection, the Vicar-General declared that Swinton's text-book was "one of the most barefaced attempts that I (he) ever saw to use the public schools for the purpose of bringing the Catholic Church into odium and contempt," etc., etc. If Mr. Cooke had read the whole interview, he knew that the Vicar-General had used these strong words in condemnation of Swinton's book; yet he deliberately cut three lines out of their connection and thus presented them for the purpose of making the Vicar-General seem to hold and express an opinion which he knew that Catholic clergymen had never held or expressed. And still he pleads innocence of garbling and distortion. His disclaimer of obligation to Mr. Mead and of misrepresenting Catholic authorities and writers recalls a cartoon in one of our comic papers, which represented a colored boy brought before a judge on a charge of chicken-stealing, and stoutly asserting that he "neber see dose chickens," while the chickens themselves were peeping out from under the broken crown of his hat.

My opponent apologizes for his tirades on all manner of side issues not practically related to the subject of discussion — Swinton's text-book — by saying that at the outset he stated his purpose to go beyond that book and use it "simply as a text." What he actually promised us at the outset was to show by "a consensus of unbiased historians" that every word contained in Swinton's text-book was true. From his first letter I will quote his exact words, which were as follows:

"Since the question has been raised by Mr. Johnson, I propose to say something at another time on the subject of indulgences, with the purpose of showing that Swinton has not been unjust to the Catholic Church, and that he does not

misrepresent its teachings of the Reformation era. What the Catholic Church teaches now is not the question in controversy, but what it taught at the time of Luther. A consensus of unbiased historians will prove that Luther had just cause for the protest he made against the corruptions of the Church. Such a consensus will substantiate every word contained in Swinton's history."

More than this, Mr. Cooke said he was satisfied "that Swinton understates rather than overstates the case against the Catholic Church at the time of the Reformation," and still more, that he believed that "all the leading historians will present the case more strongly than Swinton." Those were his propositions at the outset. He has not sustained any one of them. His array of "unbiased historians" has not yet put in an appearance. Prof. Charles K. Adams, whom he especially invoked as the highest historical authority in America, has emphatically condemned Swinton's book for the identical reasons that make Catholics object to it. Without doubt, Prof. Adams is the most respectable and strongest authority named by Mr. Cooke in endorsement of Swinton. And what does he say? Why, he declares of Swinton's account of the Reformation that "the general impression inevitably left on the pupil's mind is one of strong bias in opposition to the Catholic Church," that "it does not tell the whole truth," and finally that "it preaches the Protestant doctrine; it omits to preach the Catholic doctrine." Therefore, Prof. Adams (see his article in the Appendix to these letters) declares that to compel a Catholic "to send his children to school, or to be taxed for a school, where the Protestant view and the Protestant view alone is taught, is as unjustifiable as it would be to force Protestants into a similar position, if at some time the Catholics should get the upper hand and the tables should be turned." "And if," concludes Prof. Adams, "under such circumstances Protestants would not submit, it is simply rank injustice to demand that Catho-

lics shall submit, simply because the power at present happens to be in Protestant hands."

That is the deliberate and carefully considered judgment of the Protestant historian to whom Mr. Cooke himself gave, at the outset, the foremost place among historical authorities. I ask no more than that he abide by that judgment. Parochial school books, their merits and their defects, have nothing to do with the grievance of Catholic parents in the public schools, which Prof. Adams so calmly and concisely states. Protestants are not taxed to support parochial schools; Protestant children are not obliged to read parochial school books. Catholics are taxed to support public schools, and Catholic children are compelled to read Swinton's text-book, which, in Prof. Adams's words, "preaches the Protestant doctrine," and "omits to preach the Catholic doctrine."

What has become, then, of Mr. Cooke's appeal to "a consensus of unbiased historians"? What is unbiased history? I have always understood that the absolute truth of history was only to be ascertained by reference to original documents, and that it must be founded on and confirmed by such documents. Yet, the reader will observe that from first to last Mr. Cooke has never once cited from an original document issued by a Pope, or from any original statement or definition of doctrine by a Catholic Council, or from any authentic Catholic cathechism treating of the question under discussion. Proposing to convict the Catholic Church of teaching what Swinton says she teaches, concerning indulgences, by an appeal to "unbiased history," he utterly neglects and ignores the only genuine and indisputable body of historical evidence as to what the Church has taught either in time past or time present, namely, the original documents of her Popes granting indulgences and declaring the Church's doctrine on that subject; nor has he cited her teaching on

this question as declared by her councils or her catechisms. Mr. Cooke does, it is true, quote from some respectable Catholic writers on the subject, but in such a disjointed way as to convey an entirely erroneous idea of what they actually say. So that if we are to accept the disclaimer he makes in his last letter of any intent to garble or misrepresent them, we can only do so by assuming that the real meaning of these Catholic writers has never for one moment entered his mind. And who, pray, are some of Mr. Cooke's "unbiased historians"? They include Motley and Robertson —two notoriously ultra-Protestant partisans; Rev. Dr. A. A. Miner, Rev. Philip S. Moxom, Rev. James B. Dunn, and Mr. Ezra Farnsworth. Unless Dr. Miner is deficient in the sense of humor, he would laugh long and loud at the suggestion that he was an "unbiased historian," and Drs. Moxom and Dunn would certainly laugh with him. As for the historian, Ezra Farnsworth, his writings are unknown to me. The Boston Public Library boasts no copy of the works of this very rare historian. Truly it is a marvellous array of "unbiased historians" which Mr. Cooke has marshalled for us!

And when, supported by this brilliant galaxy of "unbiased historians," my opponent triumphantly pointed, in his first letter, to the report of the text-book committee, and said that "each member" of it "gave the book a careful examination, and expressed himself entirely satisfied with it, because of its clearness of statement, its comprehensiveness, its accuracy, and its impartiality," there evidently seemed to him nothing more to be said. Yet this learned text-book committee might have reached a quicker, less laborious, and wiser conclusion if it had gone to the standard Protestant encyclopedias and read what they contain on the doctrine of indulgences.

It must be clear to every reader that my opponent has

utterly failed to make good his opening promises. Swinton's definition of indulgences is not and cannot be sustained by non-partisan history or by "a consensus of unbiased historians." To attempt, as he has done, to sustain it by quotations from writers equally partisan with Swinton, or more so, simply heightens the affront offered to every Catholic parent.

Mr. Cooke says in his last letter (April 13) that "all intelligent people to-day wish to see the world without being compelled to use the spectacles of the Catholic or any other denomination." Then Prof. Adams being our witness, Swinton's text-book is a just cause of offence to "all intelligent people," for it does compel Catholic pupils to use Protestant spectacles in looking at the Reformation generally and at the Catholic doctrine of indulgences particularly.

"When," says Mr. Cooke, "the Catholic Church begins to meddle with the public schools I can no longer remain quiet." Nothing deserves to be more despised by all fair-play loving citizens than the cant of those who seek to use the public schools as a screen from behind which to attack the Catholic Church. Mr. Cooke mistakes his mission when he imagines himself to be defending the public schools from Catholic attack. He, and such as he, are not defending the schools from sectarian assault; on the contrary, they are the attacking party, and are doing their best to sectarianize the public schools. Their direct assault is on Catholics and the Catholic Church, but that in effect is an attack on the unsectarian character of the common schools. They are helping to introduce anti-Catholic text-books and to force them into Catholic pupils' hands. If they succeed, the unsectarian public school is as good as destroyed. And on my side I return Mr. Cooke's phrase and say that when the public schools begin to meddle with the Catholic faith, misrepresent

the Catholic doctrine, and outrage the Catholic conscience, I can no longer remain quiet.

I do not know how far Mr. Cooke represents in this correspondence the views of the School Board of Dedham as a whole. I very much regret, however, that the Board has, by its vote, kept Swinton's inaccurate and offensive text-book in the public schools, and that the text-book committee should have reported, after a professedly careful examination of its contents, that it is accurate and unobjectionable. Such a report reflects severely either upon the intelligence or the impartiality of the committee, and is deeply to be regretted as an indication that the sectarian spirit so painfully manifest in Mr. Cooke's letters holds sway, for the time being, over the text-book committee and the Board.

Mr. Cooke adds in his closing letter: "I detest all religious controversy. I have nothing against the Catholic Church as a church; I should prefer to praise it rather than to condemn it." His distaste for religious controversy is evidently quite recent. It would appear to date from his discovery that religious controversy requires some knowledge of the subject under discussion by those who engage in it. Unfortunately, he had not this knowledge, as was made painfully apparent from his pothering about the doctrine of indulgences; for any bright Catholic school boy or girl could have corrected his misrepresentations of that doctrine.

It is certainly rather late for him to find out that he detests religious controversy, after indulging in it so freely. That this repugnance to controversy is a new-born feeling on Mr. Cooke's part we may fairly infer, because it seems clear that he had no such repugnance when he began to write his letters. He was not requested by the town, the School Committee, or any one else, so far as I have heard, to take up the cudgels on behalf of "Swinton the historian." He was a volunteer champion, self-appointed to the work of vindi-

cating this sectarian text-book. Manifestly he must have at first relished his self-imposed task; and that he lays down his pen with so much dislike of what he began with gusto argues that his experience of the delights of religious controversy has not equalled his anticipations. In this experience he is not alone. Most of the assailants of the Catholic Church have had a similar realization of their untenable position as soon as they have learned something of her history and doctrine.

As to Mr. Cooke's disclaimer of hostility to the Catholic Church, and his declared preference for praising rather than condemning it, the readers of his letters may assuredly be pardoned if they received them with a smile. If Mr. Cooke did indeed desire to praise the Catholic Church, he must himself look back upon his letters to the *Standard* with great disappointment. It must surely be a source of profound regret to him that in writing so many columns about that Church he has found so little opportunity in which to gratify his preference for praising it.

The text-book being still retained in the schools of Dedham, and this discussion having been referred to in the last report of the School Committee, the publication of this correspondence will serve the useful purpose of making the grounds on which Catholic parents object to this book clearly and generally understood. It will at least place on record their protest against the sectarian coloring of the teachings in our common schools, notwithstanding the general boast that there are, and the specific provision of the law that there shall be, no sectarian text-books used therein.

In his final letter, Rev. Mr. Cooke accuses me of "mud-throwing." It will be observed that my first letters to the *Standard* were written in a thoroughly impersonal tone, and dealt with the question strictly upon its merits. It was not my desire that the discussion should take on a personal tone,

nor was it my fault that it did. I should have been much better pleased if the correspondence had been carried on to the end on the plane of calm and reasonable argument, free both from petty personalities and appeals to vulgar prejudice. But my opponent was determined from the outset to drag the discussion down to these lower levels. In his very first letter (published Dec. 22, 1888), which followed my first three letters, in none of which was there one word of a personal nature, Mr. Cooke left the subject in order to enter on personalities. I was accused of raising the sectarian issue; the authorities which I had ventured to quote were cavalierly dismissed as of no account; and I was railingly told that Swinton's slander was in fact unjust to the Catholic Church only in this way, that it did not show her and her teachings in a bad enough light. I was charged with "a desire to find offence" in a text-book where none existed. In his following letters these flings were supplemented by the imputation to Catholics of a desire to attack and destroy civil and religious liberty, of an intolerant and persecuting spirit toward their fellow-citizens, and of actual disloyalty to American institutions. Besides hurling this broad accusation of treason at the whole Catholic body, Mr. Cooke did not hesitate to charge the Catholic priesthood with selling forgiveness of sins for money. He dragged into his letter an extract from an anti-Popery correspondent, written from Italy to a Boston weekly paper, and tendered it seriously as proof of the charge that Catholic priests are pardoning guilt at certain fixed cash prices. This, if true, would place the Catholic priesthood in a position of the deepest degradation. And after offering all these bitter insults to Catholics, Mr. Cooke complains of "mud-throwing."

I fear I must plead guilty to some warmth of reply, and it may be that I ought not to have let myself repay my

assailant in his own coin. I certainly regret having yielded to his provocation, great though it was. The highest Christian ideal no doubt required that I should bear in silence with his taunts and gibes, whether at myself, at the Church of which I am a humble member, or at the doctrines and practices which that Church teaches and inculcates. Hearing the Catholic body stigmatized as disloyal citizens, I should have meekly forborne from making any retort; when the Catholic clergy were represented as tricksters and knaves, and accused of making barter and sale of the pardon of Heaven, I should have answered mildly and without heat; I should have been genteel and polite in repelling my opponent's slanders, and Rev. Mr. Cooke should have been allowed a monopoly of the "mud-throwing." But unfortunately I forgot this sometimes, and hence Mr. Cooke's indignation. Everything held sacred by Catholics, it seems, was properly enough a target for his slander and vituperation, but when a Catholic resents such treatment, and employs vigorous language in doing it, Mr. Cooke is shocked at the "mud-throwing." I regret that his delicate sensibilities on this point have been so hurt. But something will be gained thereby if he learns that Catholics will not submit to be rolled in the mud without making as much resistance as is needed to show that they have not lost their self-respect. In short, Mr. Cooke must make the best of his discovery that there are blows to be taken as well as given in a controversy carried on upon the plane to which he himself insisted on lowering it, — the plane of prejudice and personality.

A word is necessary as to the Appendix of this pamphlet. In it will be found a letter of the Hon. H. Winn, entitled "A Plea for Toleration," published in the Boston *Herald* of Dec. 10, 1888; a review of Swinton's "Outlines" by Mr. Alpha Child, which appeared in the Boston *Transcript;* an editorial on "The Teaching of History," from the *Christian*

Register of Nov. 8, 1888; an extract from an editorial on "Indulgences," in the Boston *Advertiser* of May 12, 1888; an editorial in the same paper of May 16, 1888; and a paper by Prof. Charles Kendall Adams, on "The Public School Question," all of which are referred to in the correspondence between myself and Mr. Cooke. In these articles, all written by non-Catholic writers, there are some things, of course, with which a Catholic would not agree, but in the main they deal with the subject under discussion in a fair spirit.

R. J. Johnson.

St. Mary's Church,
Dedham, Mass., September, 1889.

A SECTARIAN TEXT-BOOK.

SWINTON'S "OUTLINES OF THE WORLD'S HISTORY" SHOWN TO BE SECTARIAN BY THE HIGHEST PROTESTANT AUTHORITIES. — STANDARD WORKS OF REFERENCE REFUTE SWINTON'S STATEMENT OF THE DOCTRINE OF INDULGENCES.

[From the Dedham *Standard*, Nov. 24, 1888.]

Persons whose memories reach thirty years into the past will note a great change in the temper of sectarian discussion in our community. Time was, and that within the limit of the past generation, when the differences of opinion and of sentiment even between nearly related Protestant sects were bitter, and when all discussions of these differences were nothing if not intensely partisan. A little further back, and the orthodox Congregationalist of Connecticut found it difficult to admit that the Episcopalian's chances of salvation were really clear. At any rate they did not compare with his own certainties. The Episcopalian creed was thought to savor dangerously of "Romanism," and as to the Catholics themselves, they were held by the orthodox to be little better than pagans. Christian charity stopped, in very many cases, with them; and this was the case with so-called "orthodox" believers who were in other respects mild and even tolerant persons. The history of religious misunderstanding, to use the mildest term possible, has had a new and singular chapter in the record of the New England Puritan's zeal against "Rome" and the ancient creed and practices of the Catholic Church.

All this is happily changed, at least as far as concerns the exterior relations of Catholic and Protestant. The intrinsic differences remain, but there is more courtesy, more tol-

erance. The real trouble now is not intolerance so much as unintelligence. The Protestant is not so often discourteous to his antagonist in a religious discussion as he is ill-informed. The Protestant writer seldom sets out to make a direct attack upon the Catholic Church. But he is apt to fall into mistakes which may easily be more injurious than open attacks.

A case of this ignorant blundering has lately attracted much attention, and deservedly, because its consequences may be wide-spread if the blunders are not corrected. I refer to a school text-book by William Swinton, "Outlines of the World's History"; and I propose to examine its merits, or rather its demerits, somewhat carefully, touching first upon its attitude toward church history, then upon other points in which scarcely less of misinformation is shown, and lastly, upon the qualifications and character of the author.

The inquiry is not only timely, but pressingly necessary. The School Board of this town has voted to adopt Swinton's "Outlines" as a text-book for use in our public schools. It has done this after a professedly careful examination of the work. It says, in effect, that it contains nothing that any Catholic need find fault with. After exploring its pages with such learning and labor as it could command, it has only praises for the book. Let us see how far those praises are deserved.

And first let me remark that this action of the Board is in marked contrast with that of other school boards in this State.* The greater part of them, as soon as their attention had been called to Mr. Swinton's travesty of Catholic faith and teaching, and to the distortions of history for that

* At the time this letter was written I was informed that Swinton's "Outlines" had been passed upon by several other school boards besides that of Boston. Further inquiry satisfied me that this was not the case.

purpose which I will point out, have excluded the work from their schools. In this they have acted with fairness and liberality, and their action has been sustained by the best Protestant authorities. It will not be difficult to make very clear the causes which have determined this exclusion. But how has it happened that the School Board of Dedham has failed to detect what so many other school boards have discovered, — the rank misrepresentation of the Catholic Church in Swinton's "Outlines," and its frequent historical inaccuracy of other important points?

The "Outlines" contains, at page 320, the following extraordinary foot-note:

"These indulgences were, in the early ages of the Church, remissions of the penances imposed upon persons whose sins had brought scandal upon the community. But in process of time they were represented as actual pardons of guilt, and the purchaser of indulgence was said to be delivered from all his sins."

Is there no cause here for the action of school boards in excluding the work? Let us see what some of the boards have done, and their reasons for their action. It will be an interesting study. Among the boards which have excluded the work is the School Committee of Boston, a body certainly not less distinguished for the ability and character of its members than that of Dedham. It examined this book critically, and its text-book committee, composed of both

---

The fact, however, that school committees and school teachers elsewhere have sanctioned and approved the use of this erroneous text-book, containing statements calculated to poison the minds of pupils with anti-Catholic prejudice, would be no justification for the use of the same book in Dedham schools. A man caught poisoning the wells of one town would hardly be excused by pleading that other men were pouring the same kind of poison into the wells of other towns. And the fact that this text-book is used in so many other schools simply shows how wide-spread is the sectarian influence in school management and how general is the injustice done to Catholics.

Protestant and Catholic gentlemen eminent for their learning and culture, unanimously condemned it. Among those who joined in the report in favor of its exclusion from the public schools of Boston, was the Rev. Joseph T. Duryea, D. D., a Presbyterian divine, whose scholarship can no more be questioned than his Protestantism. Yet this is what Dr. Duryea and his colleagues on the text-book committee say:

"Members of the High School Committee called the attention of this committee to statements of the author of the text-book upon the subject of indulgences. These are contained in a paragraph of the text and a note at the bottom of the page (320). This note is indefinite; it should have been omitted or made explicit. It is misleading. In a text-book which is an outline, a guide to the teacher and pupil, every statement should be clear, definite and accurate, for the teacher is entitled to take it as such, if he be disposed, as containing a warrant of his exposition, expanding and illustrating from his memory according to his impressions or opinions, inasmuch as the book is in his hands by the authority of the Board. In the present instance the teacher appears to have done this, and to have taught that an indulgence 'is a permission to commit sin.' This is not and never was true. It is true that it has been so represented, as the note affirms; but it should add when, where, and by whom, and definitely. It certainly never was by any duly recognized authority in the Catholic Church. The attention of the agent of the publishers was called to the defective character of the note. The committee is credibly informed that the publishers themselves were advised by a competent scholar, than whom perhaps no other in this country has more weight of authority, that the note could not be approved as sufficiently explicit. . . . Ample opportunity was given for promise or action insuring a correction. This failing, the committee recommended that the book be dropped from the lists."

Speaking in the Boston School Board on the adoption of the report from which I have just quoted, Dr. Duryea, who is a representative man in whose judgment all unprejudiced Protestants will have confidence, says:

"If the facts are to be given in a history they must be given as they are, and not distorted. . . . I am surprised at the action of many of those in this community. I can only explain it by race prejudice and religion. It is assumed that there has been dictation by one religion. I should vote for the exclusion of the history in courtesy to the feelings of the Catholics. Because a man is a Catholic has he no right to have any feelings? I am surprised. It is nothing but rank, partisan, religious, bigoted, political prejudice and passion that is behind all this matter. The teachings of Swinton's school-book are not correct."

If any one is disposed, however, to cavil at Dr. Duryea's opinion, — I believe one partisan has hinted that Dr. Duryea is a Jesuit in disguise, — I can easily furnish him with an abundance of other Protestant authority in support of the Catholic objections to Swinton's "Outlines," as an untruthful, a misleading, and, as to the Catholic Church, a most unjust book.

The gist of the controversy over it turns upon its statement of the Catholic doctrine of indulgences, by which they are represented to be pardons of guilt and licenses to commit sin. I venture with confidence to say that there is not a single standard Protestant work of reference, with any reputation among scholars, which sustains Swinton's libel of the Catholic faith on this point. The "Encyclopedia Britannica," the "American Encyclopedia," the "Dictionary of Religious Knowledge," "McClintock and Strong's Biblical Cyclopedia," and the "Religious Encyclopedia," are all standard Protestant authorities; the three last named are edited respectively by distinguished Congregational, Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian clergymen. Every one of them contains an article devoted to the Catholic doctrine of indulgences, and not one of them sustains, or in the least justifies, the slander in question. All these authorities, on the contrary, support the dictum of Prof. Fisher of Yale College, the eminent church historian, who says distinctly: "To say that the Roman Catholic

Church has ever taught that the forgiveness of sins can be bought with money, is an atrocious slander."

The Protestant press, — that part of it that has any reputation for learning or critical judgment, — both religious and secular, has, I am glad to note, dealt candidly with Swinton's erroneous text-book. It cannot be that the members of our Dedham School Board are aware of the general and emphatic condemnation of it by papers of the highest standing, and of whose decided Protestant bias no one has the least doubt. For example, the Boston *Advertiser* is not a Catholic organ, but speaking of the teaching deduced from Swinton's book that the Catholic Church regards an indulgence as a "permission to commit sin," it says: "Historically the statement is not true; theologically, the topic is forbidden in the schools."

The *Christian Register* is certainly a paper whose Protestant character is undoubted, and following is its judgment on the matter:

"A public school is not the place in which to teach ecclesiastical history. Mr. Swinton half confesses this when, in his 'Outlines of the World's History,' he puts the statement in regard to indulgences, to which Roman Catholics have objected, in a foot-note. It would have been wiser if he had left it out altogether. From a Protestant stand-point, his statement may be unquestioned. But the subject is one on which Catholics also have their opinions. No public school board has a right to force on Catholic pupils historical statements on debatable points which may be said to strain the Catholic position."

In a later issue, the *Christian Register* elaborated its position, and approving the action of the Boston School Committee in regard to a teacher in the English High School, who had been complained of for his teaching in connection with Swinton's "Outlines," said:

"The committee decided unanimously that, whatever the teacher's motives in the matter, he had made an unfortunate

mistake in his method of teaching. Acknowledging the justice of the complaint, he was transferred to another department of the school. The committee also found the book which precipitated the discussion faulty in its definitions. The view of indulgences which it presented was given wholly from a Protestant stand-point. It did not recognize that there was another stand-point. To remove this occasion of difficulty, the committee decided to withdraw the book. The committee, we think, on the evidence presented, acted intelligently and fairly, and for the best interest of the public schools."

The *Examiner* is a recognized organ of the Baptist denomination, and surely will not be suspected of a prejudice in favor of the Catholics. The following is its view on the matter:

"Those who are ready on slight grounds, or on no grounds at all, to come out with charges of Romish aggression have seized upon the exclusion of this book, on account of objections entertained by Catholics to this passage, as another proof of Catholic hostility to the public schools and the determination of the Catholic leaders, if they cannot destroy the public-school system, to control it in their own interests. Rev. J. T. Duryea, D. D., who is pastor of the Central Congregational Church of Boston, and a member of the School Committee that pronounced against this book, advocates its exclusion from the schools upon the ground that it is wise to avoid any cause of suspicion that the teaching in the schools is not conducted with perfect fairness to all classes. This ground seems to be impregnable. The theory is that our public schools, supported as they are by taxes levied on all citizens alike, are for the education of the children of all citizens alike. As the religious beliefs of the citizens are not taken into account in the levying of taxes, it is right that they should be respected in the conduct of the schools. There should be nothing in the instruction or the text-books or the discipline that would give any citizen, whatever his religious belief, reasonable ground of complaint."

In a later issue the same high Baptist authority further says:

"It is evident that a citizen has a reasonable ground of complaint when a text-book states, as indisputable facts, things that are disputed by historians and theologians, or imputes beliefs to any class that are distinctly repudiated by its authorized spokesmen. It is not even admitted by all Protestants that the statement in Swinton's history regarding the Catholic doctrine of indulgences is correct. . . . The only safe and equitable rule is this: In all cases of matters about which there is controversy, no statement should be admitted into text-books to be used in public schools that is believed to be false or unfair by any class of citizens. No other principle is workable. If a Protestant majority may to-day insist on putting into text-books things distasteful to a Catholic minority, can we complain if a Catholic majority to-morrow reverses the procedure? The theory of our schools necessitates absolute neutrality in religious beliefs, and the books must be made to conform to the theory."

We are beginning to see, I think, that in protesting against the placing of this text-book in the hands of their children, Catholics are simply asking their Protestant fellow-citizens not to force upon them, in the guise of historical truth, nor to give their children, as if it were impartial education and pure information, statements which the highest Protestant scholarship has pronounced to be false and slanderous. But I will return to this subject in another letter.

R. J. Johnson.

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE CARICATURED.

THE DOCTRINE OF INDULGENCE AS DEFINED BY THE CHURCH GROSSLY DISTORTED BY SWINTON. — MANY PROTESTANT NEWSPAPERS ACKNOWLEDGE ITS UNJUST MISREPRESENTATION OF CATHOLIC TEACHING.

[From the Dedham *Standard*, Dec. 1, 1888.]

With your permission I propose offering some further observations on the tone of Swinton's text-book as judged by impartial critics. It seems to me important to put the attitude of Protestant writers clearly and fully on record,

because it is creditable to their fairness and to the growing historical knowledge which they bring to bear on questions which have been unnecessarily controverted. Fuller knowledge, greater fairness, — surely no one can object to these; not even the publishers who have put forth, originally in ignorance of its true character let us hope, the little book which has been the cause of so much misrepresentation.

The book itself is not, indeed, worthy of long discussion; but the principles which have been raised by it are among the gravest which could become a cause of misunderstanding. And when the misunderstanding is centuries old, one which has fomented unnecessary discord between Protestants and Catholics ever since the sixteenth century, it becomes the duty of all fair-minded students to examine and to settle forever, each for himself, the causes of the disagreement.

Let me return, therefore, to the essential subject-matter of this controversy. The text-book in question, as I said in my first letter, attributes to the Catholic Church the representation of indulgences as actual pardons of sin. Any student of church history knows that this is now, and always has been, false. What is the true doctrine of the Catholic Church in regard to indulgences?

It may interest readers who do not understand the doctrine of indulgences to quote an authoritative definition of an indulgence. The catechism ordered to be adopted by the third Council of Baltimore includes the following questions and answers:

"Q. What is an indulgence?

"A. An indulgence is the remission in whole or in part of the temporal punishment due to sin.

"Q. Is an indulgence a pardon of sin, or a license to commit sin?

"A. An indulgence is not a pardon of sin, nor a license to commit sin, and one who is in a state of mortal sin cannot gain an indulgence."

Will my Protestant readers in particular be good enough to note how far it is from implying anything like a "permission to commit sin"?

Father Macleod says:

"By an indulgence is meant the remission of the temporal punishment due to sins already forgiven. Every sin, however grievous, is remitted through the sacrament of penance, or through an act of perfect contrition, as regards its guilt and the eternal punishment due it. But the debt of temporal punishment is not always remitted at the same time. The latter is done away with by deep penitence, or by works of satisfaction, *e. g.*, prayer, alms, fasting, or by patient endurance of troubles and adversities sent us by God, or by the satisfaction of our Lord Jesus Christ and the saints, applied to us by the Church under certain conditions; which application we call an indulgence. An indulgence, then, is not a pardon for sin, because sin must be remitted before an indulgence can be gained. Much less is it a permission to commit sin, . . . for even God himself could not give such permission. In order to gain any indulgence whatever one must be in a state of grace."

And this doctrine has always been the doctrine of the Catholic Church. That abuses of it arose is true; that the Church ever sanctioned them is not true. And to show how generally even Protestant journals of scholarship and fairness recognize the fact, I will make a few more quotations from representative papers.

The Boston *Beacon* is a paper that cannot be suspected of any bias in favor of the Catholic Church, and which enjoys considerable reputation as a critical authority in literature. Here is its opinion:

"The Boston School Committee has dropped William Swinton's 'Outlines of the World's History' from the books authorized for us in our city high schools. The reason for this is the foot-note (already quoted) on page 320 of the book. As a matter of fact, it is not absolutely wrong when understood quite literally; for many a Protestant believes

to-day that the Catholic Church sells indulgences for money, and represents an indulgence to be a pardon of sins past and prospective. But Mr. Swinton's statement really conveys the idea that the Catholic Church treats indulgences as actual pardons of guilt, and sells them for cash. For very naturally the second sentence of Mr. Swinton's, being connected with the first in a separate note, is understood to represent the position of the Church in later ages precisely as the first represents the belief of the Church in 'the early ages.' The sentence would be unobjectionable if Mr. Swinton inserted the words 'by ignorant or unfriendly persons' after the word 'represented.' The statement as now printed in the book is not legitimate. On the contrary, there is a special reason why the teachings of the Catholic Church in regard to indulgences should have been presented with scrupulous fairness, that is to say, in terms approved by the Catholic Church in its official capacity. School-books should contain demonstrable or historical truths only, and if the Boston School Committee will insist upon this point, the community will profit."

The same paper, in a later issue, returns to the subject and says further:

"The School Committee has dismissed the petition asking for the reinstatement of Swinton's History. The petitioners and the two ladies who have seen fit to act as the champions of the book are unable to hold their ground. The book should not be used, not only because of the wretched note on indulgences, but also because it misrepresents the beginning of the Protestant Reformation. A book that publishes fiction in the place of historical facts should not be used in any school, least of all in our public schools."

In other articles, which I cannot here quote without making this letter too long, the *Beacon* points out the grossly inaccurate character of Mr. Swinton's book, not only as to indulgences, but as to many other matters of importance, and says emphatically that it should not be used in our public schools, where nothing but indisputable truths should ever be taught.

The Boston *Saturday Evening Gazette*, another paper not to be suspected of Catholic leanings, says:

"It is folly to attempt to make an issue between Protestants and Catholics on the basis of a difference of interpretation of a difficult historical question. The Roman Catholics are quite right in demanding that a public-school teacher shall not constitute himself a judge of a question of scholarship and research so difficult to decide that there are probably not a hundred men in the United States competent to speak upon it.

"We hope it was not Roman Catholic influence alone that helped in this matter. We hope level-headed Protestants used their influence in the same direction. For, looked at broadly, it is not a petty question of sectarianism, but it is the large question of an historical difference; and whether it be decided one way or the other by a school teacher, is not the trouble: it is that the teacher did not admit the nicety of the point, and remain, personally, coldly neutral concerning it. There are undisputed facts enough that a teacher may inculcate, and if he be a modest man, if he be a consecrated student, he will be very loath to be dogmatic about uncertainties. The text-book itself is well out of the way,— there are at least two as good as Swinton's,— and to do away with the book removes at once the main cause of irritation."

The Boston *Daily Advertiser*, which I have already briefly quoted, will not, I suppose, be accused of undue favoritism towards Catholics. In an editorial comparing Swinton's "Outlines" with Prof. Fisher's "Outlines," that paper says:

"Those people who are crying out against the School Board for its action in voting to drop from the list of text-books Swinton's 'Outlines of the World's History,' would do well to consider whether they would be willing to have a text-book used in the public schools of Boston which could be made the basis of a slanderous misrepresentation of the various religious sects to which they are attached. . . . A reader of Swinton would conclude that it was the Roman Catholic Church by which these indulgences 'in process of time' came to be 'represented as actual pardons of guilt';

while a reader of Fisher would understand that this impression was created in the popular mind solely by the way in which 'the business was managed in Germany at the time,' an understanding confirmed by everything that this most eminent church historian has written on the subject, an understanding sanctioned by every Protestant writer of recognized authority in Europe and America."

In our magazine literature we shall find the same feeling. A writer in the *North American Review* for December says:

"I am speaking entirely from the point of sight of a Protestant — a Protestant not only by every trait and tincture of heredity, but by every conviction of reason; a Protestant to whom some of the assumption of the Roman Church seems not only unwarrantable, but well-nigh intolerable. But," continues this writer, "the differences between Protestants and Catholics are not to be fought out in the public school. There are times, seasons, fields for this fight; but the public school is not one of them. Truth is of the first importance. If any truth of history is so hidden, remote, doubtful, that we cannot come to an agreement about it, it is far better to leave it alone than to teach as indisputably true, what, at best, is only disputably true. If there is so much to be said on each side that neither side can convince the other, the only resource is to suppress both sides or insert both sides. To force either side to accept the other's view is mere absolute despotism. . . . In the realm of thought is no rule of the majority. . . . Nothing should be taught in the schools supported by the common fund except that which is accepted by the common faith. . . . Whatever makes the public school odious weakens its hold. Nothing can make it so odious as attacks upon the religious, whether or not false, faith of any of its supporters. If the attacks are well founded, they are altogether out of place. If they are ill founded, they have no place."

A Unitarian clergyman, the Rev. Minot J. Savage, in a recent discourse at the Church of the Unity, in Boston, struck the same note:

"Were I a Catholic," he said, "I would fight to the bitter end the teaching of a doctrine to my child which I believed

to be pernicious to his welfare in this world and the next. I object to my children being taught sectarian ideas by the State. We have no right to teach sectarianism in the public schools."

And if we look for testimony upon this question outside of the Christian Church, we shall find the same views as those already quoted. The Rabbi Solomon Schindler, a short time ago, said in his synagogue :

"In the public schools . . . a text-book which should be offensive even by one single sentence to a class of citizens should be dropped at once."

As I said in my earlier letter, the original offence in the present case was rather a blunder than an intentional affront. Neither the publishers nor the Protestant community have anything to gain by fomenting bad feeling, and least of all in the management of the schools in which the children of both Catholic and Protestant meet on equal grounds. Nothing is more to be deplored than a misunderstanding here. The heart of the trouble is the incompetence of the men who write our text-books, and sometimes, it is to be feared, of the men who are instrumental in introducing them.

"Most of our school-books," says the *Beacon*, "are the work of cunning publishers and the men they hire. Most of these books are 'introduced' by a contract that the cunning publishers conclude with more or less incompetent school committees."

Our school expenses are now very large, and it is all the more important that books should not be bought which have to be abandoned. This is a point for tax-payers in connection with this matter, which may well be kept in mind. Text-books cost money. The annual appropriation for text-books is simply wasted when it is spent one year for books

which have to be put aside as useless the next. Already the tax-payers have seen this appropriation used to buy the works of a Coffin, and later to purchase Welsh's "Development of English Literature," all of which are now piled up on the shelves of the School Committee rooms, admittedly unfit for use in the public schools; and to this heap of literary lumber there will no doubt be presently added the works of Swinton, the great historian. School expenses are increasing every year; and the text-book appropriation is a considerable item on the bill. How do the tax-payers like the policy of buying cart-loads of text-books which are no sooner bought than by reason of their inaccuracy, as well as their offensiveness to a large portion of the parents of the children, they have to be discarded?

It is deplorable that in cultivated New England it should be found so difficult to bring together in the production and the censorship of text-books a competent writer, an intelligent school board, and a fair-minded publisher.

I will not multiply quotations upon the points already mentioned. I think that I have already cited enough, and from a sufficiently wide range of authorities, to show the entire reasonableness, by the admission of learned, able, and fair Protestant writers, of the Catholic objections to this text-book. I submit them with confidence to the candid and dispassionate judgment of the people of Dedham.

The action of our School Board in retaining this book in our schools is a clear case of injustice to Catholic parents. Certainly they ought not to be taxed for the purpose of spreading before their children, in the guise of history, statements that falsify the doctrines of their Church, distort its history, and hold it up to contempt. As Catholics we are constantly misrepresented as seeking to introduce into the schools text-books that have a Catholic coloring. We seek to do nothing of the kind. We are simply asking

that the text-books put into the hands of our children shall not be such as have a distinctly anti-Catholic coloring, or such as unmistakably distort the truth of history and, in the words of the *Advertiser*, convey a contrary impression to that which is "sanctioned by every Protestant writer of recognized authority in Europe and America." In a word, our appeal is from the lowest anti-Catholic prejudice to the highest, most learned, and most reputable Catholic and Protestant opinion. We have nothing to fear from the higher tribunals of historic and religious culture; it is only the clamors of the ignorant and the prejudiced that we deprecate. Surely the interest of no church can be served by the ignorant or careless historian, the neglectful board, or the manœuvring publisher. All that we ask is intelligence and fair play.

In another issue of your paper, if I am permitted, I will conclude the subject by pointing out some further grave objections to the text-book in question.

R. J. Johnson.

SWINTON'S INACCURACIES.

HIS "OUTLINES" CONSIDERED ON ITS GENERAL MERITS, AS AN ELEMENTARY TEXT-BOOK. — NOT ONE CHAPTER OF IT DEVOTED TO THIS COUNTRY. — GEN. GRANT'S OPINION OF SWINTON.

[From the Dedham *Standard*, Dec. 8, 1888.]

With your permission I now purpose to offer a few observations on the general merits of Swinton's much-discussed text-book. I have already shown, I think, to the satisfaction of all fair-minded persons, that Catholics have a just right of complaint concerning Swinton's misrepresentations of the history and the teachings of the Catholic Church. This much, out of the mouths and from the pens of eminent

writers, Protestant and Hebrew, I certainly established in my letter last week.

Setting aside however its unfair, because untruthful, treatment of the Catholic Church and its doctrines, I assert that Swinton's book is a defective work, wofully lacking in essential points as an elementary text-book on general history, and grossly inaccurate in many statements of facts relating to civil as well as religious history. In short, I claim that no intelligent parent, whether Protestant or Catholic, can desire to have his children taught history from a book so full of blunders; a book from which, besides, the bare mention even of many important historical events has been omitted.

My first point will be one in which I think no one will gainsay me. I suppose there will be a general agreement on the part of Americans that the United States has enough importance in the history of the world to justify at least one chapter being devoted to it in any text-book that professes to give the "outlines of general history." Yet this book of Swinton's does not devote a single chapter to this country. George Washington is generally conceded to have played an important part in the history, not only of America, but of civilization; yet there is nothing in the Swinton text-book to let the Dedham school boys and girls know that such a man ever lived. The name of "the Father of his Country" is not so much as once mentioned in its pages. Is that the kind of text-book from which our children are at all likely to obtain a solid and satisfactory grounding in the elementary facts of history?* Well may the Boston *Beacon*, a well-known literary weekly, say of it:

* Mr. Swinton excuses himself in the Introduction to his "Outlines" for omitting all reference to the United States by saying that pupils are supposed to have become acquainted with the history of the United States by previously studying other text-books, intended to precede the "Outlines." Obviously the "Outlines of the World's History," by its author's

"A 'World's History' that is substantially silent on the United States does not deserve a place in the public schools of this country. The book is intended for high schools and academies. Yet its maps are so crude as not to indicate longitude and latitude; still Mr. Swinton praises them. The book is without chronological tables, and otherwise unfit for use."

An elementary history without chronological tables is almost as great an absurdity as an elementary arithmetic would be without multiplication tables. Yet it is a text-book of this sort that the Dedham School Board have declared to be what is wanted in the town's schools.

I venture to quote the *Beacon* again as to the educational value of this book. In its issue of Sept. 22 last, that able paper said:

"Probably the worst books used in our schools are the grammars of English; they do much harm, and apparently no good. Next in order stand the school histories. . . . Among them is Swinton's book, now under discussion here in Boston. The friends of our public school seem to think that Swinton's History should be retained as a matter of principle. But no intelligent student of history would think of defending Swinton's account of the beginning of the Prot-

---

own confession, is a misnomer, for it furnishes little more than the outlines of European history, and those very inadequately. Mr. Alpha Child, of Watertown, N. Y., an able writer, reviewed Swinton's "Outlines" in two exhaustive articles in the Boston *Transcript* of Feb. 4 and 8, 1889. Those who desire to get the judgment of a pronounced Protestant critic of intelligence on the general merits of the text-book which has so strangely succeeded in gaining the approval of our learned text-book committee, are referred to an extract from Mr. Child's review, printed in the Appendix to this pamphlet. Mr. Child has the same misconception of the Catholic doctrine of indulgences as Mr. Cooke and most other Protestant writers who have participated in this controversy without first informing themselves of this important Catholic doctrine from authoritative sources. Sharing Mr. Cooke's confusion of ideas as to what the doctrine of indulgences is, Mr. Child does not, however, share the curious blindness of Mr. Cooke and our learned text-book committee to the many glaring errors and the general weakness and deficiency of Swinton's "Outlines" considered simply as an elementary historical work.

estant Reformation, the point under discussion. That account is hopelessly bad, and proves conclusively that Swinton has not read the principal document of the time, Luther's ninety-five theses of 1517. Whoever will read them — they are translated in Dr. Schaff's Church History — cannot help admitting that on Oct. 31, 1517, Luther was a pretty good Catholic, and a Papist to boot. Now our schools should use accurate books only."

It is not only true, as the *Beacon* points out, that Swinton has only half stated and misstated the facts about Tetzel and the Catholic doctrine of indulgences, but he has given an account of the origin of the Protestant movement which not only Catholics, but all educated Protestants, know to be thoroughly incorrect. Swinton states (page 320 of his "Outlines") that "The Dominican Friars, having obtained the monopoly of the sale (of indulgences) in Germany, employed as their agent Tetzel," etc. Now as a matter of fact Tetzel was not the agent of the Dominican Friars, but of the Archbishop of Mainz (Mayence or Menz). Swinton proceeds to unfold the story of Luther and the Reformation movement as follows:

"Martin Luther, Professor of Theology in the University of Wittenburg, took the lead in opposing Tetzel. . . . He appealed to the people and to men of letters (1517) by publishing ninety-five theses condemning the sale of indulgences as contrary to reason and scripture."

In these few lines of print there are certainly two very great errors of fact: (1) Luther, in his famous theses, did not "appeal to the people and to men of letters for redress"; (2) Luther did not condemn indulgences. A non-Catholic critic, before cited, says:

"In fact on Oct. 31, 1517, when Luther published his theses, he was not only an orthodox Catholic, but a Papist, and did not mean to be anything else. Like other reputable Catholics, Luther appealed, in 1517, to the Pope, and later on from the Pope to a council, to remedy the Tetzel abuse,

which no reputable Catholic writer has ever justified. As late as March 3, 1519, Luther wrote to the Pope declaring his entire loyalty. In a word, Mr. Swinton's account is hopelessly wrong."

Later in life Luther said that in 1517 he was "a raving Papist," and that he "would have readily murdered any person who denied obedience to the Pope." All this was changed; but when Luther published his ninety-five theses, he did not protest against the Pope, or the Roman Church, or any of her doctrines. His appeal was not to the people and to men of letters, but to his ecclesiastical superiors and to the Pope. The theses made no mention whatever of Tetzel, and they distinctly asserted the truth of the Catholic doctrine of indulgences. The seventy-first of Luther's theses reads thus: "He who speaks against the truth of papal indulgences, let him be anathema and accursed."

By way of ascertaining how far wide of the sober truth of history is Swinton's version of Luther's relation to the Reformation, so called, I commend Protestants who are willing and desirous to get at the facts, to consult Dr. Philip Schaff's "History of the Christian Church," published by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Dr. Schaff is not a Catholic; he is a Presbyterian scholar. But of Luther's theses, he says that they

"sound very strange to a modern ear, and are more Catholic than Protestant. They are no protest against the Pope and the Roman Church, or any of her doctrines, nor even against indulgences, but only against their abuse. They expressly condemn those who speak against indulgences. . . . They imply belief in purgatory." (Page 157.)

On this it has been well observed by a Protestant writer already quoted that

"If anybody had told Luther that he was a church reformer, Luther would have repelled the charge with an execration.

And throughout his life he knew that the Church of God cannot be reformed by man, and that the church of man is not the last importance."

Pointing out the general inaccuracy of the work, as well as its special errors in regard to the account of Tetzel, Luther, and the ninety-five theses, the *Beacon* in another article says:

"On page 485 Mr. Swinton says that by the labors of the brothers Grimm 'comparative philology was raised to the dignity of a science.' It is not worth while to say anything in our public schools about comparative philology. But if anything must be said, it is right to state that Francis Bopp raised comparative philology to the dignity of a science, and that the Grimms confined their attention to the Germanic languages. On pages 226 and 227 Mr. Swinton tells us that 'the speech which arose in the island (Britain) from the intermixture of the various German dialects took the name of Anglo-Saxon,' and that the Anglo-Saxons became Christians in the seventh century.' Now the word 'Anglo-Saxon' is a much later coinage; it means English Saxon, as opposed to Continental Saxon, and it does not mean a mixture of Angles and Saxons. In fact, Anglo-Saxon is an ink-horn word, and as suitable as if one were to call the people of New England 'Britishers.' On the same page we are told that the Franks and Goths, unlike the Saxons, adopted the language and religion of Rome. The Goths were Arians, not Catholics; the Franks are to this day the purest German stock. On page 483 we are told that about 1871 'Austria and its adjuncts formed a separate kingdom known as the Austro-Hungarian monarchy.' Austria-Hungary is an empire, not a kingdom, and has existed for centuries past. But enough has been said to show that Mr. Swinton's book should not be used in our public schools, where nothing but indubitable truths should ever be uttered."

I submit that I have shown what I promised to show, — the generally defective character of Swinton's "Outlines" as a text-book, quite apart from its demerits as a sectarian work highly colored with anti-Catholic prejudice. But before I leave the subject, it will be in order to speak of the

author as well as the book. Who is "Swinton the historian"? The phrase has an impressive sound; it would seem to be the name and description of a respectable authority, a high-toned scholar and a man of letters. Is Swinton such a man?

For an answer to this question let us look into Gen. U. S. Grant's "Memoirs." On pages 143 to 145 of volume two we shall find a pen-and-ink picture of this now notorious "historian," which deserves to be considered by everybody who undertakes to defend the "Outlines" as either a fair or a truthful book. For on those pages Gen. Grant has recorded it in black and white, and insured it remembrance as long as the book is read, that Swinton trespassed on his confidence, broke his own pledged word of honor, and played the ignoble part of a spy and eavesdropper in the camp of the Union Army. He says in his "Memoirs" that Swinton reported to the Southern press his (Grant's) instructions to a member of his staff, which he (Swinton) had overheard, and that, on a later occasion, the "historian" was caught listening to a private conference between Gen. Meade and Gen. Grant, and was forcibly interrupted in his eavesdropping. Later still, at Cold Harbor, Gen. Grant tells us that news was brought to him that Gen. Burnside had ordered Swinton to be shot for some grave offence he had committed within Burnside's lines. Gen. Grant concludes his remarks upon the "historian" with these words: "I promptly ordered the prisoner to be released, but that he must be expelled from the army, not to return again on pain of punishment."

That is Gen. Grant's testimony to the character of "Swinton the historian"; and it is well to bear in mind that the "Memoirs" in which it appears was not written in the haste or heat of the moment, but more than twenty years after the close of the war. Gen. Grant was not a passionate or a vin-

dictive person; he was, on the contrary, a singularly self-controlled, calm, and magnanimous man. Yet such was the deep impression which Swinton's dishonorable conduct had left on his mind, that long afterward, at the close of a ripened life, when he was writing what he knew was to be the last work of his pen, a work which would be read by all his countrymen, he thought that "Swinton the historian" deserved to be publicly gibbeted. That was Grant's deliberate and well-considered opinion of the author of the "Outlines" now under discussion; for it was only after twenty-two years of reflection that he gave it to the world.

Is the man thus pilloried by Gen. Grant the kind of man from whose pen we should expect either fair or truthful history? Hardly. Catholics might well expect that in such hands their Church would be calumniated and their faith traduced. But they did not expect that the Dedham School Board would insist on putting into the hands and before the eyes of their children the indignities offered by Swinton, the condemned spy, to their religion, as if those misstatements were the sober truths of impartially written history. Any friend of the public schools who is desirous of their welfare, and of seeing them so conducted that Catholic as well as Protestant children can safely stay in them without having their religious faith assailed, ridiculed, or undermined, must protest against the retention of Swinton's "Outlines" as one of the text-books.

A representative Protestant paper, already quoted, discussing Swinton's book, pertinently says:

"Let us for a moment put the shoe on the Protestant foot, and see just where it pinches. . . . How many Protestants would wince at having Dr. Schaff's statement inserted in Mr. Swinton's book, declaring that 'the fact is undeniable that the Reformation in Germany was followed . . . by a degeneracy of public morals.'"

And this paper shows that Dr. Schaff is not alone in this admission, but is corroborated by other high Protestant authorities.

"Finally," it says, "we remind our readers that a book intended for a text-book in the public schools must be tried by tests which may not be applied to a book for the individual student. Catholics, Protestants, Jews, and children of all nations gather in these schools. A book which does not carefully avoid all religious and national partiality ought to be carefully excluded as a source of strife and division."

There are those who fear and deprecate the movement for parochial schools. To such I commend the sensible words of a Protestant weekly, the *Christian Register*, which says:

"The question of the action of the Boston School Committee in removing a defective text-book and reprimanding an injudicious teacher, has been unnecessarily complicated in public discussion with the question of parochial schools. We have actually seen it assumed that the action of the committee was in favor of the Catholic demand for such schools. On the contrary, the influence of the committee's action is just in the opposite direction. It assures Catholics that the public schools shall remain unsectarian in character, that their children may go to them without being compelled to study ecclesiastical history through Protestant interpretations."

There is a suggestion in these remarks of the *Christian Register* that is well worthy of being thought about. If Catholic parents are expected to support the public schools with their money, collected by the public tax-collector, and contentedly to send their children to be educated in those schools, the text-books used in them should at least not be such as to trample on their deepest religious convictions, and hold their faith up to contempt before the eyes of their children.

I cannot believe that the good sense of the community will fail to perceive the absolute necessity of keeping sec-

tarianism, of whatever kind, out of our public schools, and of making a higher standard of intelligence imperative among those who govern them.

If I have spoken with some warmth upon this subject, it has been with the warmth of conviction. The subject is one that is worthy of the most serious attention of Catholics and of Protestants alike. I trust that the warnings which have been so clearly sounded in the non-partisan press will not be allowed to pass unheeded. R. J. JOHNSON.

SWINTON'S HISTORY.

THE REV. GEORGE W. COOKE'S FIRST LETTER.

[From the Dedham *Standard*, Dec. 22, 1888.]

My attention has been called to three articles published in the *Standard* and written by the Rev. R. J. Johnson. These articles criticise the action of the School Committee in retaining Swinton's history as a text-book in the public schools. At the same time, they attempt to prove that Swinton is not a man of good character, and that he is not a reliable historian. I propose to make answers to these allegations, and to show that Mr. Johnson is mistaken in the opinions he has expressed.

Swinton's "Outlines of the World's History" has been in use in the Dedham High School for several years, and it has always been found an acceptable book.* Last spring Mr. Johnson called the attention of the School Committee to Swinton's method of dealing with the Catholic Church and its teachings. The book was then referred to the committee on text-books for consideration, and that committee reported unanimously in favor of its retention. Each member of this

* Mr. Cooke, on page 60, says that the book was not introduced till "the beginning of the spring term of 1888." — R. J. J.

committee gave the book a careful examination, and expressed himself as entirely satisfied with it, because of its clearness of statement, its comprehensiveness, its accuracy, and its impartiality. The text-book committee having thus reported, the School Committee voted to retain the book.

Mr. Johnson claims that the retention of Swinton's book was an act of injustice to the Catholic Church. I do not agree with him in that opinion. The Catholics of Dedham have always been well treated by the School Committee. The sectarian question has not been raised, so far as I know, in the choice of teachers. A full proportion of Catholic teachers have been employed, and they have not been discriminated against in any manner. Since I have been a member of the committee the only occasions when the sectarian question has been raised have been those on which it has been brought forward by Mr. Johnson himself.

Then again, is it at all probable that the members of the School Committee would retain Swinton's book in order to do injustice to Catholics? Probably, too, the readers of the *Standard* will have as much confidence in the historical judgment of the text-book committee as in that of Mr. Johnson. The simple fact is, that the book was retained because it was believed to be the best book on the subject now to be had, and because it was believed to be as accurate and fair as any history for schools now published.

Swinton's book must be judged on other grounds than those of his relations to Gen. Grant and his connection with the Civil War. This argument of Mr. Johnson has nothing whatever to do with the merits or demerits of the case. Does the book thoroughly answer the purpose for which it is used? That is the only question which needs consideration.

Mr. Johnson quotes the opinion of the *Beacon* and the *Christian Register* with reference to the worth of Swinton's books; but such authorities are of no importance in regard

to such a question as this. They are defending their own position, and care less for truth than to make out their own case. The editors of those papers, very able gentlemen as they are, are in no sense historical authorities on the worth of Swinton's book. Let us take up some genuine historical standard, and see what that has to say. Here is "A Manual of Historical Literature," compiled by Prof. Charles Kendall Adams, Professor of History in the Michigan University, and now President of Cornell University. Its purpose is to give students information in regard to the best historical works; and it is the recognized standard authority for all who are interested in historical subjects. Mr. Adams is a man of great ability; and he stands at the head of the new school of historians in this country.

I propose to quote in full what Prof. Adams says about Swinton's book. In speaking of general histories he says that Swinton's is a very useful book for a bird's-eye view of universal history. When he comes to speak of Swinton's book by itself, he uses the following language:

"Prepared specially for the use of higher classes in public schools, high schools, and academies, the author made no original investigation in the preparation of the book; on the contrary, he appropriated with great freedom from the works of others whatever seemed best suited to his purpose. Mr. Swinton is not, like Freeman, a great historian, but he has the knack, above almost all other men of his time, of knowing what a young scholar wants and needs. The result in the book before us is a work of great and deserved popularity. It has the extraordinary merit among school histories of being interesting. In the hands of a really good teacher it might be less interesting than it is; but really good teachers of history are not so abundant as to make this feature a serious fault. It is also admirably equipped with tables, maps and illustrations. If the student or general reader desires a bird's-eye view of the world's progress, his choice between books in English should be between this and the little volume of Freeman's."

Here is the highest historical authority we have in this country commending Swinton's book as being next in importance to the work of the best historian of the age. If there is a better book, however, why not take that? For the reason that Freeman's book has no maps or other aids, so important in teaching history to young people. Mr. Johnson quotes the *Beacon* to show the imperfection of Swinton's book in maps, etc. I decidedly prefer the opinion of Prof. Adams, who highly commends the tables, maps, and illustrations.*

I wish also to quote the testimony of Mr. Edwin D. Mead,† who has made himself well known among historical students by his connection with the Old South Church historical lectures. He has been for several years the leader of this movement to educate the people in history; and his work in connection therewith has commended him for his wide learning, his impartiality, and his historical ability. His position is one of entire independence, and he has written of the Catholics with great liberality. On more than one occasion

* By consulting the latest edition of Prof. Adams's work the reader will find that in it he has omitted all reference to the maps, illustrations, and tables. In the first edition it is probable that he intrusted the examination of the maps and illustrations to an assistant, who failed to observe their illegible, inaccurate, and altogether inferior character. Prof. Adams's remark that Swinton "made no original investigation in the preparation of the book," but "appropriated with great freedom from the works of others," is very true. Swinton's appropriation from the works of others has indeed been very free — whole pages at a time, and one paragraph after another, being thus taken. It is strange, however, that Mr. Cooke, presumably chairman of our learned text-book committee, should not have discovered the extremely poor quality of these maps. It is calculated to shake one's confidence in his knowledge of geography. As to some of the illustrations, they are almost as bad. Any reader can satisfy himself of the cheap quality of some of them by turning to page 130 of the "Outlines" and noting the very delicate (?) picture there presented. There are limitations of length necessary to be observed in writing letters for a newspaper, but for which I might have pointed out to the reader the many errors with which this book abounds; as it is, I must refer him to Mr. Child's review in the Appendix, page 192. — R. J. J.

† See foot-note on page 55.

recently, he vigorously protested against the sectarian spirit in discussing the school question. When he comes to speak of Swinton's History Mr. Mead uses these words:

"I should never have known, had not the present controversy prompted me to a critical examination, how excellent a book this little history of Swinton's is. I have been especially impressed by the impartiality and the rare tact with which the author steers through those stormy periods where Catholicism and Protestantism clashed — the time of the Huguenots and St. Bartholomew's, the time of Alva in the Netherlands, the religious persecutions, now Catholic, now Protestant, under Henry VIII. and Mary and Elizabeth. I should especially like to speak of Swinton's warm recognition of the services of the Catholic Church during the Middle Ages. I should like to quote his high tribute to the monasteries, which were the arks of learning and the centres of almost every civilizing influence left in those dark and troublous centuries succeeding the breaking up of the old Roman system."

With such high and unprejudiced authorities commending Swinton's book, can any one wonder that I wish to retain it? It is said by Mr. Johnson, however, that Swinton is not just to the Catholic Church. I believe the fact is that Swinton under-states rather than over-states the case against the Catholic Church at the time of the Reformation. I believe that all the leading historians will present the case more strongly than does Swinton. When I read what Swinton says about indulgences and the other corruptions of the time I was struck with his moderation, his desire not to be sectarian, and his absolute regard for facts. Had there not been a desire to find offence none would have been found in Swinton's book.*

If we teach history in our public schools, are we to teach truth or are we to teach something other than truth? That is a question of very grave importance for consideration in

* Yet the *Christian Union* pronounces it "a perfectly reasonable complaint." See quotation from that paper on page 51. — R. J. J.

dealing with the young. The spirit of fearless investigation into the past is the only one which can bring us the truest results of history. We are not to cover up the past for the sake of our own party or sect, and we are not to warp it aside from the facts in order to make our own case appear well. Let us have the unvarnished truth, and let us teach that without fear of its doing injury to the young.

Since the question has been raised by Mr. Johnson, I propose to say something at another time on the subject of indulgences, with the purpose of showing that Swinton has not been unjust to the Catholic Church, and that he does not misrepresent its teachings of the Reformation era. What the Catholic Church teaches now is not the question in controversy, but what it taught at the time of Luther.* A consensus of unbiased historians will prove that Luther had just cause for the protest he made against the corruptions of the church. Such a consensus will substantiate every word contained in Swinton's History. GEORGE W. COOKE.

THE CATHOLIC POSITION.

DIFFERENCES OF FACT AND OPINION. — A BALANCING OF AUTHORITIES.

[From the Dedham *Standard*, Dec. 29, 1888.]

In your issue of Dec. 22, the Rev. George W. Cooke criticises the articles in which, in former issues of the *Standard*, I have stated the Catholic position in the matter of the textbook known as Swinton's "Outlines."

There are some differences of opinion and some questions

---

* On page 82, however, Mr. Cooke takes up an exactly opposite position. He there declares that "the Church has not changed its doctrine of indulgence since the Reformation. What it taught then it teaches now, and indulgences are still sold." There is an irreconcilable conflict of statements here. — R. J. J.

of fact between Mr. Cooke and myself. The differences of opinion I am content to leave to the judgment of those who have followed our controversy; the questions of fact are matters to be settled by proof. So let us first consider the facts, proceeding from those of less to those of greater importance.

1. Mr. Cooke says that Swinton's "Outlines" "has been in use in the Dedham High School for several years, and it has always been found an acceptable book." As a matter of fact, this is not a correct statement. While there may have been a copy or two in the High School, this text-book has not been in regular use there for several years. This is a simple matter of fact; and before Mr. Cooke takes a reconnaissance of mediæval history and gives us his views on "the Reformation era" and "the teachings of the Catholic Church in the time of Luther," as he promises to do in the closing paragraph of his letter, it would be well for him to show some accuracy as to the records of our own day, and to verify his statement that the "Outlines" has been in use in our High School "for several years." To the best of my knowledge and belief that statement is not true.

His added statement that "it has always been found an acceptable book" is certainly untrue. Who is it that has "always" found it acceptable? Not the Dedham School Board, for that body never passed upon it until recently, after I made objection to it. Not the Catholic parents of Dedham; most assuredly they have not always or ever found it acceptable, for it never has been, or will be, acceptable to them. To whom, then, does Mr. Cooke refer as having always found this book acceptable? Perhaps to himself, which I can believe. I suspect that its author might go much further in his misrepresentation of the Catholic Church and her teachings, and still be found acceptable to the receptive mind of Mr. Cooke.

2. "The Catholics of Dedham have always been well treated by the School Committee," says Mr. Cooke. This statement raises what in legal phrase is termed a mixed question of fact and opinion. So far as it is a matter of opinion, Mr. Cooke must excuse the Catholics of Dedham from accepting him as a good judge of whether they are well or ill treated. No doubt he thinks he has treated them not only well, but too well; but his standard of fair treatment and ours is not the same. It has been said that a man measures corn by whatever bushel he happens to carry about with him for that purpose; and whenever Catholic corn gets into a "no-Popery" measure, we need not look for it to run more than three pecks to the bushel.

Mr. Cooke adds that "a full proportion of Catholic teachers have been employed, and they have not been discriminated against in any manner." What is Mr. Cooke's idea of a full proportion? Here it happens that we can test his measure. The Catholics of Dedham are the parents of a full half of all the children in the public schools. About one fourth of the teachers are Catholics. At this ratio, if Catholics furnished all the children they would be entitled to furnish only one half of the teachers. It is evidently important to keep a sharp eye on Mr. Cooke's bushel measure. Fifty per cent less than a fair equality is "a full proportion," as he understands it. A discrimination of fifty per cent against Catholic teachers is no doubt very fair measure for them; perhaps fairer than they would get if he were the autocrat of Dedham. But why raise this issue, which has nothing to do with the main points in debate?

3. Mr. Cooke says that "the only occasions when the sectarian question has been raised have been those on which it has been brought forward by Mr. Johnson himself." This, again, is a question purely of fact. Mr. Cooke does not cite a single instance when I have attempted to obtain

any sectarian advantage for the Catholic Church or her doctrines; nor can he cite any such action as that on my part. Can he name any occasion when I have sought to introduce into the public schools a distinctively Catholic text-book, or a text-book that was in the least degree colored with Catholic doctrines or teachings? If I have ever done so, there must be some proof to show it. I invite him to search the record from the time I first entered the Board down to this day, and to produce any proof of my ever having attempted to give a sectarian bias to its action. Mr. Cooke may say, doubtless, that I have often protested when Catholic children have had their faith abused by certain text-books being placed in their hands which held that faith up to contempt and ridicule. That is true. But the trouble is with Mr. Cooke's three-peck bushel for measuring out justice to Catholics.

4. Mr. Cooke intimates that it is not "at all probable that the members of the School Committee would retain Swinton's book in order to do injustice to Catholics," and he adds that "probably the readers of the *Standard* will have as much confidence in the judgment of the text-book committee as in that of Mr. Johnson." Mr. Cooke's "probablys" are wide of the mark. The question at issue is one of established fact, not of probability. It was not my opinion that the School Committee was asked to accept as against its own. The question of the merits of Swinton's text-book is not one between the School Committee and myself, nor between Mr. Cooke and myself, as he seeks to make it appear. I have not presumed to urge my own opinion against that of Mr. Cooke or the Board in regard to this text-book and its libel on Catholic doctrine. On the contrary, I have presented opinions taken entirely from non-Catholic sources. I have cited Prof. Fisher, of Yale, eminent the world over as a scholarly Protestant of the

highest authority on church history. Prof. Fisher calls the Swintonian account of the doctrine of indulgences "an atrocious slander." My poor judgment may not be worth much, but Prof. Fisher may perhaps be entitled to measure opinions with the Dedham School Board or even with the redoubtable Mr. Cooke himself.*

I also referred to the leading Protestant encyclopedias, including such standard works as the "Encyclopedia Britannica," the "Library of Universal Knowledge," the "American Cyclopedia," the "Dictionary of Religious Knowledge," the "Religious Encyclopedia" and McClintock and Strong's "Biblical Cyclopedia." Not one of these works, though they are edited by scholars of the most pronounced Protestant schools, — Methodists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists,— gives the slightest support to Swinton's travesty of the Catholic doctrine of indulgences. Surely eminent divines like Dr. Philip Schaff (Presbyterian) and Dr. Lyman Abbott (Congregationalist) are not entirely beneath the benign consideration of Mr. George W. Cooke, or of the Dedham School Board.

---

* Writing in the April (1889) number of the *Forum*, Prof. Fisher gives his judgment as to how history should be taught in the public schools as follows: "The field of history is the avenue where doctrinal disputes are more likely to be kindled. Of course, as between Protestants and Roman Catholics, there should be in the instruction which is given, whether orally or by the text-book, strict impartiality, and a studious avoidance of statements that might, with good reason, give offence to the adherents of either form of religion. Facts should be honestly stated, no matter where they may strike; but never in a way to make a false or one-sided impression, or to wound the religious sensibilities of reasonable Christians professing either of the two creeds. *For example, the Roman Catholic doctrine of indulgences should not be erroneously defined, but should be explained as the remission, not of guilt, but of penances; and what is meant by penances should be correctly explained. The abuses connected with the disposal of indulgences just before the Reformation should be referred to; but, when this reference is made, the statement should be coupled with it, in justice to both sides, that the Council of Trent solemnly condemned such abuses, and undertook to prevent their recurrence.*"

Mr. Cooke says, with an air of conscious superiority of judgment, that "such authorities" as the *Beacon* and the *Christian Register* are of no importance in regard to such a question as this. "They are defending their own position, and care less for truth than to make out their own case." This statement is made without substantiation or proof, and I think the readers of the *Standard* will agree with me in thinking that such an assertion will not enhance the writer's strength as a fair-minded disputant. But I would remind Mr. Cooke and your readers that the *Beacon* and the *Christian Register* were not alone among the able journals whose opinions I have quoted. The list of newspapers whose editorial opinions prove to be "of no importance" when measured by Mr. Cooke's bushel, includes the Boston *Herald*, which, unconscious of the dictum of our Dedham oracle, speaks as follows:

"It shows the correctness of the action of the Boston School Committee in the matter of Swinton's history that nearly the whole religious press, without regard to creed, sustains their position."

This opinion of the Boston *Herald* is borne out by the fact I have already shown in former articles by quotations from the *Examiner* and the *Watchman* (Baptist), the *Christian Register*, and other religious as well as secular papers. The *Congregationalist*, for example, than which no stouter Protestant paper is published in America, editorially said, and with a clearness and manifest fairness which might have appealed even to Mr. George W. Cooke:

"The question, what did the preachers of indulgences in Luther's day actually represent them to be? is exciting considerable interest in Boston because of the transfer by the committee of a High School instructor from the department of history, for teaching, among other things, that 'in process of time they were represented as actual pardons of guilt, and the purchaser of an indulgence was said to be de-

livered from all his sins.' The book, Swinton's 'Outlines of History,' in which this passage is found, has also been removed from the schools. It will be seen by any one who consults Dr. Fisher's able exposition of the subject, on the first page, that the sentence just quoted is one of those inaccurate and misleading generalizations which are to be found in too many of our short school histories. That there were flagrant abuses connected with the sale of indulgences is acknowledged by all fair-minded Catholic historians, but that any accredited authority of the Roman Church was accustomed to commend these indulgences as pardons of guilt, is an assertion unsupported by the facts of history. In our controversy with Catholics, we have strong ground, and there is no occasion to weaken our position by an over-statement, not to say mis-statement, of the evils historically connected with the Roman Church."

Mr. Cooke says: "Had there not been a desire to find offence, none would have been found in Swinton's book." Contrast with this the just editorial remark of the *Christian Union*, speaking of the action of the Boston School Committee in excluding the book:

"When a perfectly reasonable complaint was made against the untrue statement of a text-book on the subject of indulgences, Protestant prejudice was ready to be fired. Some no-Popery apostles were ready to fire it."

5. We ought not, perhaps, to be astonished at the graceful manner in which, as by a wave of his hand, Mr. George W. Cooke delivers judgment in favor of Swinton's "Outlines" and against Prof. Fisher and all the other eminent authorities who have borne this testimony against the accuracy of that text-book. At first sight it seems a trifle presumptuous for one man to set his opinion against that "of nearly the whole religious press, without regard to creed," and in an ordinary man it would be presumptuous. But Mr. George W. Cooke has had some valuable experience in this line which takes him out of the category of every-day critics. We must be mindful of his feat in text-book

criticism, when in 1885, under the law requiring physiology and hygiene to be taught in the public schools, he made a lengthy and learned report to the School Committee in favor of certain text-books on those subjects. The High School text-book which was fortunate enough to win the favor of his approval was "Hygienic Physiology," by Joel D. Steele. Of this and two other books on the subject Mr. Cooke was pleased to speak, in a report which he considered valuable enough to print in full in the *Standard*, as follows: "These are the only books which I have seen which really emphasize the temperance side of the subject, and give that the importance which the law evidently contemplated." "This series," he went on to say, "is the best adapted to the needs of teachers, because the most simple and practical in the information it conveys." Finally, of Mr. Joel D. Steele's "Hygienic Physiology," Mr. Cooke said, with the positiveness of assertion which becomes a critic of the highest rank, "The concluding book is well adapted to use in the High School and it imparts the kind of information pupils most need to have given them."

On what grounds of merit was this praise based? About a month after the promulgation of these authoritative judgments, the Boston *Medical and Surgical Journal*, recognized as a leading authority of the medical profession, reviewed this same work of Mr. Joel D. Steele's. Instead of concurring in Mr. Cooke's verdict, the *Medical and Surgical Journal* showed the absurdity of its statements concerning alcohol, and convicted the author of contradicting himself in his own pages. In the course of its criticism it further said of this book:

"The sensational colored plates used to illustrate the effects of alcohol on the stomach might with propriety find a place in a patent-medicine almanac, but such travesties upon pathology should never form a part of a

system of education. Especially should the wretched plum-pudding-like figure at the bottom of the page, entitled 'Cancerous Stomach,' have been omitted, not only on account of its utter want of accuracy, but also having no connection, either possible or probable, with the subject of alcohol. Singularly enough, this text-book is accompanied with a circular endorsed by twelve person, not one of whom is an expert in physiology or hygiene; not one, in fact, is a physician."

It was perhaps unfortunate for the Boston *Medical and Surgical Journal* that it failed to agree with Mr. George W. Cooke on the merits of a text-book on hygiene. It was almost as fatal to its reputation as it is to the reputation of Prof. Fisher of Yale, and "nearly the whole religious press, without regard to creed," to dissent from Mr. Cooke's judgment on Swinton's statements of religious history and doctrine. It is painfully evident that, alike in the domain of medicine and history, there are many eminent experts who have yet to learn that the supreme court of criticism sits at Dedham, and that its rescripts are handed down by Mr. George W. Cooke.

It is to be hoped that Mr. Cooke will draw his future knowledge of mediæval history from more authentic sources than those whence he has derived his knowledge of physiology and hygiene.

6. The rest of the differences between us is matter of pure opinion. He cites Prof. Charles K. Adams as warmly endorsing Swinton's "Outlines." The endorsement quoted is, observe, quite guarded and general. Prof. Adams begins by saying that Swinton "made no original investigation in the preparation of the book"; which may account for the fact that "nearly the whole religious press, without regard to creed," finds its statement about indulgences to be, as the *Congregationalist* well puts it, "one of those inaccurate and misleading generalizations which are to be found in too many of our short school histories."

Prof. Adams's endorsement of the "Outlines" goes on to remark that "Swinton is not, like Freeman, a great historian," which is indeed quite indisputable. Prof. Adams finds, however, that the book is "interesting." He might have added that it is neatly bound in cloth, and can be quite conveniently carried in a book-strap. That would have made the eulogy a little more specific and less general. Does Mr. Cooke imagine that he helps his case at all by quoting this very general commendation of Prof. Adams, who, it will be noted, does not even remotely allude to Swinton's statement of the Catholic doctrine of indulgence, to which, evidently, his attention was not directed when he wrote? Yet that, and that only, is the question at issue between Mr. Cooke on the one hand, and "nearly the whole religious press, without regard to creed," on the other. It may be observed that Prof. Adams could hardly have said less than that the book was "interesting." Yet he calls this "its extraordinary merit"—that it is "interesting." This recalls forcibly the story of the author who sent President Lincoln a copy of his book, with a request that he would kindly write him his opinion of it. Mr. Lincoln good-naturedly, but cautiously, complied with the request, and gave his critical opinion in these words: "I have read the volume you sent me, and I take pleasure in saying that for those who like such a sort of book as this is, it will be exactly the sort of book that they would like." I am willing to say as much as that myself for Swinton's "Outlines," and Prof. Adams does not say a great deal more.

What does Prof. Adams really say upon the question in debate? In a long article on the public-school question, Dec. 13, 1888, he says, speaking of Swinton's account of the Reformation:

"While it might not be easy to point out a single positive misstatement in Swinton's narrative, the general impression inevitably left upon the pupil's mind is one of strong bias in

opposition to the Catholic Church, and in favor of Luther. It may tell the truth, but it does not tell the whole truth; and this is equivalent to saying that it tells a partial truth, and presents it in such a way as at least to have the effect of a partial falsehood. It preaches the Protestant doctrine; it omits to preach the Catholic doctrine."

Truly Mr. Cooke's effort to prove Swinton's book unsectarian has cost him much. It is a useless struggle against the truth.

The opinion of Mr. Edwin D. Mead, who is the only other person Mr. Cooke can find to say a good word for this book, I shall not permit myself to discuss.*

The weight of the authorities I have cited in this and my former articles is not seriously shaken by the quite general remarks quoted from Prof. Adams, and in no way offset by the assertion of Mr. Mead. The deliberate judgment of "nearly the whole religious press, without regard to creed," is, as I have shown, that Swinton's statement of the doctrine of indulgences is a slanderous misrepresentation of Catholic faith and teaching. That is enough to justify the Catholic complaint against it. To retain it in the schools of Dedham is to inflict insult and injustice upon every child in whose hands it is placed.

Mr. Cooke insists that Gen. Grant's opinion of Swinton has nothing to do with the merits or demerits of his text-

* I cheerfully recognize the able character of Mr. Mead's pamphlet, which has been so extremely useful to my opponent. But, skilful and polished writer though he is, Mr. Mead simply does not comprehend the doctrine of indulgence as the Catholic Church teaches it. A Protestant authority justifies me in this assertion. The Rev. C. C. Starbuck, than whom there is no stiffer champion of Protestantism, in the *Christian Mirror* of April 20, 1889, declares Dr. Hedge's notions, and Mr. Mead's after him, respecting the Roman Catholic doctrine of the forgiveness of sins, to be in what Mrs. Nickleby would have called "a hopeless state of conglomeration."

I regret that Mr. Mead, who has made so candid and courageous a speech, should be no better informed on the doctrines of the Catholic Church.

book. Why not? Swinton is being discussed as an historian; but has the character of a writer nothing to do with the quality of his work? Is an honest author no better than a dishonest one? Is it quite immaterial what the reputation of an historian is for veracity? Is it true that a dishonorable, unveracious man is just as likely to write high-toned, truthful history as a man with a high sense of honor and a scrupulous regard for truth? These questions answer themselves, and Mr. Cooke merely trifles with the intelligence of your readers when he pretends to say that Swinton's character as a man of honor and truth has "nothing whatever to do with the merits or demerits of the case." It has a great deal to do with them. Gen. Grant shows in his "Memoirs" that Swinton was an eavesdropper and a spy, a man who abused the confidence placed in him, who broke his plighted word, and who proved himself so utterly untrustworthy that he was adjudged worthy of the shameful death awarded under military law to men who behave with conspicuous baseness and treachery. Mr. Cooke may think it of no consequence whether our school-books are written by men of that stamp, or by men of strict honor and rectitude; but as I have said, this is a matter upon which there is a difference of opinion.

I invite Mr. Cooke to take note of the fact that it is not my opinion of Swinton's text-book that he is called upon to meet. It is with the opinion of non-Catholic papers like the *Congregationalist* and *Christian Union* just quoted, that he is in collision. And as the Boston *Herald* says, "nearly the whole religious press, without regard to creed," has endorsed that opinion. I know and feel, and humbly acknowledge, that Mr. Cooke's three-peck bushel is a very copious measure; but after all I may be allowed to doubt whether the light of "nearly the whole religious press, without regard to creed," can be successfully smothered under its inverted bottom.

Mr. Cooke says he will hereafter write about Luther and the Reformation era. He will prove that Luther did this, that, and the other thing, and had good cause for doing it. Mr. Cooke is welcome to educate himself in public. His studies in history will be received with interest and edification. But when he announces that he will undertake to prove that "a consensus of unbiased historians . . . will substantiate every word contained in Swinton's history," he shows himself to be one of those persons — alas, too numerous — whom it is necessary to instruct before one can argue with them. "With ignorance," says Schiller, "the very gods contend in vain." Let Mr. Cooke sit quietly in his study for a while; let him learn something of the history of the Lutheran epoch; and Mr. Cooke will find that he has undertaken a contract which neither he nor any other man can carry out.

I have now responded to the main points that have been raised in the present discussion. But I cannot enter into a set controversy with him, or with any other man; and I shall decline to follow him over the broad fields of Lutheran history upon which he proposes to enter for the first time. I shall hold him strictly to the one vital point in the debate, — the doctrine of the Catholic Church in regard to indulgences.

Swinton's "Outlines" contains this statement:

"These indulgences were, in the early ages of the Church, remissions of the penances imposed upon persons whose sins had brought scandal upon the community. But in process of time they were represented as actual pardons of guilt, and the purchaser of indulgence was said to be delivered from all his sins."

To say, as this statement implies, that the Catholic Church ever taught that an indulgence was a pardon of sin, or a permission to commit sin, is a libel on the Catholic Church, and

a slanderous distortion of its doctrine. It represents the Catholic Church as teaching what she never taught. It travesties her tenets and caricatures the faith of her members. Let Mr. George W. Cooke observe that until he can show this to be a true statement of the Catholic doctrine of indulgences (which every Protestant scholarly authority, and "nearly the whole religious press, without regard to creed," agree in saying it is not), until then he cannot by any amount of literary labor among the historians of the Lutheran epoch "substantiate every word contained in Swinton's History." The statement above quoted from Swinton contains a falsehood, and implies more falsehoods. While I cannot permit myself to be drawn into controversy upon irrelevant points, I await with composure and curiosity the promised effort of Mr. Cooke to prove the historical truth of a lie.

R. J. JOHNSON.

A DEFENCE OF SWINTON.

LETTER FROM THE REV. GEORGE W. COOKE.

[From the Dedham *Standard*, Jan. 19, 1889.]

The debate about Swinton's "Outlines of History" is only a symptom, and not the disease itself. So much has been said against the use of that book in the public schools, it is desirable that the cause of opposition to it have a thorough examination. In seeking that cause it may be well to look beyond the book itself, that the motives may be discovered of those who oppose it. Such an examination is demanded, not in the interest of Swinton's book, which is quite able to take care of itself, but in the interest of the public schools.

Americans believe in the public school, for it is the sustaining agent of all that is good in their institutions. Every

attack upon the public school is an attack upon all that goes to make up American freedom and prosperity. The attack upon Swinton's book is simply a disguised attack upon the public school, and in the interest of the parochial school. Whoever examines the subject on all sides, and with an unprejudiced mind, cannot well arrive at any other conclusion.

I have no prejudice against the Catholic Church.* I wish it well in every good work it is doing. I thoroughly believe in the public schools, however, — in their aims, in their methods, and in their results. When the Catholic Church attacks the public schools, and seeks to destroy them, as a loyal American I am bound to oppose the Catholic Church in that and every similar attempt which it makes. In saying that the Catholic Church is opposed to the public schools I appeal to the facts of history, and not to any prejudices of my own.

In what follows I appeal to facts. They are incontrovertible. I appeal to the great historians, and to the statements of the Catholic Church itself. Swinton's book is my text: but what the opposition to that means can only be understood in the light of what the Catholic Church is doing everywhere in regard to the subject of education. The Catholic Church does not approve of the American methods of education. That is why it is opposed to Swinton's book.

---

*This will be readily recognized as a stereotyped phrase of the Pope-haters. They are always prefacing their diatribes with declarations of the love of fairness and justice. "I have no prejudice against the Catholic Church," are words that simply express Mr. Cooke's concession to this habit of making protestations of liberality.

If, in reality, he had no prejudice against the Catholic Church, he would have at least abstained from grossly misrepresenting her. His claim of a disposition to be fair is simply the meaningless platitude which every defamer of the Catholic Church employs before making an unusual display of narrowness and intolerance. — R. J. J.

I.

Swinton in the Dedham High School.

At the beginning of the spring term of 1888, Swinton's "Outlines of the World's History" was introduced into the Dedham High School.* The request for it came from Miss Storms, approved by Mr. Slafter, who, at that time, had never heard of any objection to the book as being sectarian in its character and influence. When this request was made to Mr. Crocker, then the superintendent of schools, it was not possible to secure its approval immediately by the School Committee. As it seemed desirable to have it at once, Mr. Crocker procured a few copies of the book, and its study was entered upon in Miss Storms's room. This method of introducing a new book may have been irregular, but it was in accordance with all the precedents of the School Committee. The part taken in the transaction by Mr. Slafter, Miss Storms, and Mr. Crocker is a sufficient guarantee that there was not the slightest purpose of introducing into the High School a book not proper in its character or incorrect in its teachings.

Very soon after the introduction of the book a request by the Rev. R. J. Johnson was made to Mr. Channell, who had then become the superintendent, that Swinton's book be removed from the High School until the School Committee should take action upon it. This request was granted by Mr. Channell, and the book was removed. The text-book committee, consisting of Messrs. Cooke, Kimball, and Wakefield, carefully examined the book, held a meeting for its consideration, and unanimously voted to approve it. When this action was reported to the School Committee, the book was regularly adopted as a text-book for the High

* Yet on page 40 Mr. Cooke says the book "has been in use in the Dedham High School for several years past." — R. J. J.

School. At the same time, Mrs. Abrahams had used, merely as a book of reference for her class in English literature, two copies of Welsh's "Development of English Literature." Objection was also made to that book, and the School Committee voted that its use should not be continued in the High School.

As the reader may see by the letter of Miss Storms, published in the *Standard* of last week, no reference whatever had been made to indulgences in her class, when the request to withdraw the book was presented. Miss Storms emphatically declares that her "definition of indulgences was never asked for nor given."

During the spring term of 1888 the subject of indulgences presented itself in Mrs. Abrahams's class in English literature. While Chaucer's "Canterbury Tales" were being briefly referred to by the teacher, she said that Chaucer was considered to have favored the Reformation, judging by his satires on the friars and pardoners (a word used by Chaucer in his poems), and by his sympathy with the Wicliffites. A member of the class asked who the pardoners were; and, on being told that they were those who sold pardons or indulgences, asked what were indulgences. The teacher defined indulgences in the briefest manner, as she understood them. Mrs. Abrahams in no way intruded upon the private opinions of Catholics, but referred her pupils to the standard authorities. On the authority of Mr. Slafter, I am able to say that on no occasion since he has been connected with the High School have the beliefs of Catholics been discussed or intruded upon in that school, so far as he knows.

From the foregoing statement of facts it would appear that not the slightest attempt has been made by the School Committee, or by the teachers of the High School, to introduce the sectarian question into the public schools of Dedham. If it is said that the introduction of Swinton's book

was in itself a sectarian action, then what follows is my answer to that charge.

II.

Where Swinton's Book is used.

It has been said that a greater part of the school boards of Massachusetts excluded Swinton's book from their schools, "when their attention had been called to Mr. Swinton's travesty of Catholic faith and teaching." * The fact is, that Boston is the only place where such action has been taken; and in that city one half the members of the School Board were Catholics at the time.† Swinton's History is used in more than one hundred cities and towns in Massachusetts, and it is used in very nearly every high school in the State. It is used in the following towns and cities at the present time: Brockton, Chelsea, Concord, Cambridge, Fall River, Gardner, Hingham, Holyoke, Hyde Park, Hudson, Leominster, Lynn, Malden, Marlboro', Milford, North Adams, New Bedford, Newton, Quincy, Springfield, Somerville, Salem, Watertown, Waltham, Worcester, and several others.

In the State of Maine Swinton's History is used in Bath, Bangor, Castine, Lewiston, Biddeford, Saco, Waterville, Portland, Calais, Houlton, and many other places of importance. In New Hampshire it is used in Dover, Keene, Manchester, Nashua, Concord, Portsmouth, and right on through the State. In Vermont it is used in Brattleboro, Bennington, Montpelier, Burlington, Rutland, St. Johnsbury, and in almost every other town and city. During the year 1888, Swinton's History was for the first time introduced into about twenty New England towns. These include Easton, Andover, Dedham, and the Westfield Normal School, in Massachusetts; Newcastle, Gorham, Kingston, Machias-

* See foot-note on pages 17 and 18. — R. J. J.

† This statement is incorrect. — R. J. J.

port, Pembroke, Greenville and the Farmington State Normal School, in Maine; and Pawtucket in Rhode Island.

Swinton's History is not only popular in New England, but it is quite as popular in most other parts of the country. It is the most popular and best selling high-school text-book now published in the United States. It is used at the present time in more than nine tenths of the high schools in this country; and in a great proportion of the academies, seminaries, and normal schools where the course of study calls for the use of such a book.

Whatever may be said about Swinton's "Outlines of History" by the newspapers, secular or religious, it is emphatically approved by the teachers of the country. They find it the best text-book on history they can procure; and they evidently accept its teachings as being correct. As a body, the teachers in the high schools of the country are quite likely to know what is historically true.*

III.

Swinton on the Catholic Church.

Swinton's History is remarkably well written for a text-book. It is concise, graphic in style, brings out the salient facts, and makes history a living reality for the pupil.† He gives the dates and the leading facts, but in a manner to impress them upon the pupil, and to make him feel that history is not a mere succession of dates and events. It is

---

* See closing paragraphs of Mr. Child's review, pages 200, 201. — R. J. J.

† Contrast this opinion with that of Mr. Child, whose review of the book is reprinted in the Appendix, page 192. In this review Mr. Child, after pointing out the many errors in Swinton's "Outlines," its omissions of important matters, and its heedless blunders, declares that it comes within the application of the excellent doctrine laid down by the Boston *Transcript*, that "being false, it is not a fit text-book for American youth." While giving his opinion of Swinton's style, Mr. Cooke might have gone on and said with truth that the "Outlines" abounds in grammatical errors, which, in many cases, make it extremely difficult to understand what he means to say. — R. J. J.

written in a very attractive manner, and yet it is so arranged as to be remarkably fitted for use in the school-room. Not only has Swinton made a well-arranged text-book, but he has grasped and mastered the great events of history so as to present them in a vivid and in a highly suggestive manner. He displays genuine qualities as a historian, clearness of conception, mastery of events in their larger relations, and an active insight into the more intricate and important meanings of history. The book is in every way well fitted to give the pupil an outline knowledge of the history of the world. These qualities of ability, fairness, and historic insight should be taken into consideration in deciding whether Swinton's book is one which ought to be retained in the public schools.

Does Swinton misrepresent the teachings of the Catholic Church? as has been charged. In answering this question, it is best to appeal to the book itself. Those paragraphs of Swinton's book which have been the cause of controversy are on pages 319 and 320, and they will be cited in full, in order that the reader may have an opportunity of judging of the merits of the case:

"It happened very soon after the beginning of the sixteenth century, that great controversies on matters of religion arose. There was complaint at many practical abuses in the Church, and at the claims of the Popes to interfere in the affairs of nations; and there was also a growing feeling among many that not a few of the doctrines which were believed, and of the ceremonies which were practised, in the Church, were contrary to Scripture.

"It was in this state of affairs that there arose a dispute, trivial indeed in its nature, but which kindled a flame that quickly spread over most of Western Europe. When Leo X. came to the papal chair, he found the treasury of the Church exhausted by the ambitious projects of his predecessors. He therefore had recourse to every means which ingenuity could devise for recruiting his exhausted finances, and among these he adopted an extensive sale of indulgences, which in former ages had been a source of large profits to the Church. The Dominican friars, having obtained the monop-

oly of the sale in Germany, employed as their agent Tetzel, one of their own order, who carried on the traffic in a manner that was very offensive, and especially so to the Augustinian friars.

"One of these, named Martin Luther, professor of theology in the University of Wittenberg, took the lead in opposing Tetzel. Having vainly sought to procure the suppression of the traffic from the Archbishop of Magdeburg, he appealed to the people and to men of letters (1517), by publishing ninety-five theses condemning the sale of indulgences as contrary to reason and Scripture.

"These indulgences were, in the early ages of the Church, remissions of the penances imposed upon persons whose sins had brought scandal on the community. But in process of time they were represented as actual pardons of guilt, and the purchaser of indulgence was said to be delivered from all his sins."

This is Swinton's account of the origin of Protestantism; and the foot-note is the chief cause of complaint by Catholics. A careful and a fair-minded reading of the whole passage, as cited, together with the foot-note, ought to make it evident that Swinton does not say that the Church taught, as one of its doctrines, that "the purchaser of indulgence was delivered from all his sins." His language bears the fair interpretation that he charged this teaching, not upon the Church, but upon some of its over-zealous members. When all that he says about the Catholic Church is taken into consideration, and the liberality with which he speaks of it everywhere else, this interpretation is the only one which can be justly given to his words. With this interpretation, which ought to be accepted, when there is no good reason for any other, the charge against Swinton falls to the ground. A willingness to deal liberally and honorably with a writer, as to the meaning of his words, would remove all objection to the teachings of Swinton's book on the part of Catholics.*

* A very complete answer to Mr. Cooke on this point will be found in the editorials of the Boston *Post* (page 118), the Boston *Beacon* (page 126),

IV.

Swinton's Statement Endorsed.

Does Swinton give a true interpretation of the teaching and the practice of the Catholic Church in the matter of indulgences? In answer to this question I propose to cite several good authorities. The following expressions of opinion were called forth by the controversy over the book in Boston during last summer and autumn, subsequent to the displacement of the book by the Boston School Board in June.

Mr. Edwin D. Mead, a very competent authority, said of the book, in a public address, which was published under the title of "The Roman Catholic Church and the School Question":

"I maintain that this note states the substantial truth of history. But it is not true that the note affirms, as the Committee says it does, that indulgences have been represented as 'permissions to commit sin.'" *

The same opinion was expressed by Dr. A. A. Miner,† who said, in speaking of Swinton's book:

---

and the *Congregationalist* (page 119), and in the letter written by Hon. H. Winn to the Boston *Herald* (page 126), as well as in two notable editorials in the *Christian Union* of Jan. 10 and 24, 1889, quoted on pages 128 and 129, and in an editorial in the Boston *Advertiser* of June 20, 1888, quoted on page 121. Prof. Charles Kendall Adams, Mr. Cooke's favorite historian, also declares that Swinton's account of the Reformation preaches "the Protestant doctrine" and "omits to preach the Catholic doctrine." (See page 125, and his article in full on page 212.) — R. J. J.

* See foot-note on page 55, and foot-note on page 45. — R. J. J.

† In the *Christian Mirror* (March 23, 1889), Rev. C. C. Starbuck, a clergyman of the most pronounced Protestant type, writes as follows of Dr. Miner's treatment of the question: "But I should like to ask, are there in Boston no copies of the Acts of Trent, and no authorized catechisms? Surely a gentleman who has embarked so zealously and representatively in a controversy whose very pivot is Rome's doctrine of the forgiveness of sins, ought to show a reasonable intelligence as to this doctrine. But I must be permitted to say that he shows an unreasonable unintelligence, striking blindly about, merely because he has not thought it worth while to ascertain Roman doctrine from authentic sources. . . . Dr. Miner thus resembles a man who imagines he sees a ditch before him,

"Its definition of indulgence is undeniably correct. Its statement of the corruptions that grew up in connection therewith suggests nothing that is not strictly true, on the whole, but is a feeble statement of the truth."

The same position was maintained by several of the leading clergymen of Boston, in a petition which they signed:

"The paragraph which led to the book's objection contained a true statement of history, on the assertion of standard authorities of all schools.

"(Signed) Revs. Philip S. Moxom.
David Gregg.
A. J. Gordon.
John F. Clymer.
James M. Gray.
James R. Dunn.
Nelson B. Jones, Jr.
Ezra Farnsworth."

An old and leading religious journal, the *Evangelist*, June 28, 1888, made this comment on the foot-note in Swinton's History:

"That seems to us a very fair statement of the facts of the pardoner's trade as it existed at the time, and the Protestant members of the Committee must have had other reasons than its incorrectness for displacing the book."

Another able religious journal, the *Congregationalist and Boston Recorder*, in its issue of Nov. 29, said:

"The general estimate of the Inquisition which it presents, and most of its special declarations, are historically correct, and ought to be taught."

The *Transcript*, one of the most scholarly and able of the Boston daily newspapers, has repeatedly expressed itself as

---

and, receding, plunges into a ditch behind him. And all because he did not care to look up one or two easily obtainable books. Now general Protestantism suffers when we fall into these slips, as we all do, more or less, and we ought to take one another up sharply over them, so as to compel each other into a greater accuracy as to Roman Catholic affairs than we are accustomed to think it worth while to cultivate." — R. J. J.

approving the teachings of Swinton. In its issue of Oct. 1, it said:

"But judging from Mr. Travis's experience, the instructor, while allowed to teach that there was a Reformation, must not tell his class why Luther protested against Tetzel's sale of indulgences. Not only must he not do that, but he must teach that an indulgence was what we know and what Martin Luther knew it was not."

The Boston *Record* of June 20 expressed its understanding of the subject in these words:

"The recent suppression of a history for stating a fact perfectly well known and fully proved was a partisan and unwise concession to a spirit which will work mischief if indulged."

The Boston *Herald*, which has been quoted as strongly disapproving of Swinton's History, in its issue of July 14, after a careful review of the whole subject, said:

"The statement made by Prof. Swinton in his school history is fully sustained by all acknowledged authorities, whether secular or religious, though the Roman Catholic authorities generally accessible in English are rather shy of giving all the facts of the case, while the Protestant writers are often so sure of them that they present a very distorted record."

To these Protestant opinions may be added that of a very high Catholic authority. In the Boston *Globe* of Oct. 6, 1888, was printed an interview with Vicar-General Byrne, a leading Catholic official, who declared that Swinton does not misrepresent the Catholic Church in what he says about indulgences.* When asked if the doctrine that indulgences permitted the committing of sin was not taught in Swinton's book, the Vicar-General answered:

"Not that I can see; though I have heard it so stated by men who ought to know. I have seen the celebrated footnote only in quotation, and, judging from that, I would have to absolve Swinton from this charge. It would appear that it is not in Swinton's History except in so far as the imagina-

* See Vicar-General Byrne's letter on page 123. — R. J. J.

tion and preconceived notions of Mr. Travis, the High School teacher, injected into it. This is another illustration of how people find in books and dogmas what is not there at all, not even in germ. I defy any honest and unprejudiced mind to infer this shameful doctrine from Swinton's foot-note."

Further on in the interview, the Vicar-General made use of this emphatic declaration:

"One thing is certain. Swinton never charged Tetzel with giving this false definition of an indulgence."

The quotations just given show a remarkable unanimity in declaring that Swinton is not in error in what he says about indulgences and the early history of Protestantism. Several of them also indicate the fact that Swinton does not charge the Catholic Church with teaching that an indulgence was a permission to sin.

In two or three succeeding issues of the *Standard*, I shall discuss other phases of this important subject.*

GEORGE W. COOKE.

THE DEFENCE CONTINUED.

SECOND LETTER OF GEORGE W. COOKE.

[From the Dedham *Standard*, Jan. 26, 1889.]

V.

What is an Indulgence?

In order to understand whether Swinton has misrepresented history or not, it is desirable that we should know

* It was in consequence of this announcement by Mr. Cooke of his intention to continue his letters through two or three succeeding issues of the *Standard* that I did not reply to this letter in the next number of that paper, which otherwise I should have done. In view of his announcement, I stood aside, and would have held my peace until he had concluded all that he desired to say, if I had not felt it my duty to interrupt him for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that his alleged quotations from Catholic authorities were distortions and mutilations of the writers whom he appeared to quote. This also accounts for the irregular order in which my replies to Mr. Cooke's arguments were made. — R. J. J.

what is an indulgence. As the standard histories are not generally accessible, and as many persons are too busy to consult them, I propose to quote from two or three of them at some length. I do so in order that I may give a definition which will stand the test of rigid historic investigation. All the definitions which I now quote are from historians whose works are accepted by Catholics as being fair and accurate.*

I will begin with the definition given by that generally approved authority, the "Encyclopedia Britannica":

"Indulgence, in Roman Catholic theology, is defined as the remission, in whole or in part, by ecclesiastical authority, to the penitent sinners, of the temporal punishment due for sin. . . . That theory may be said to resolve itself into two positions: (1) that, after the remission of the eternal punishment due for sin, there remains due to the justice of God a certain amount of temporal pain to be undergone, either before death in this world, or after death in purgatory; (2) that this pain may be remitted by the application of the superabundant merits of Christ and the saints, out of the treasury of the Church, the administration of which treasury is the prerogative of the hierarchy. . . . Indulgences are either general or particular, *i. e.*, either open to the whole Church or confined to particular localities. The most general of all is that which is proclaimed in the year of jubilee. Indulgences again are either plenary or non-plenary, the former being a total remission of all the temporal punishment which may have been incurred by the recipient. It must carefully be borne in mind that, in Roman Catholic orthodoxy, indulgence is never absolutely gratuitous, and that those only can in any circumstances validly receive it who are in full communion with the Church, and have resorted to the sacrament of penance, in which alone, after due contrition and confession, provision is made for the remission of the graver penalty of sin."

* Mr. Cooke has no right to speak for Catholics in this matter. Catholics do not, and, of course, cannot, accept definitions of the doctrines and teachings of their Church by Protestant authorities, for however fair the spirit of these writers may be, they write entirely from the Protestant stand-point.

Prof. George P. Fisher, of Yale College, in his work on "The Reformation," a book highly approved by students for its accuracy and fairness, touches upon the origin and history of the doctrine of indulgences: —

"Indulgences, in the earlier ages of the Church, had been a relaxation of penance, or of the discipline imposed by the Church on penitents who had been guilty of mortal sin. The doctrine of penance required that for each sin satisfaction should be superadded to contrition and confession. Then came the custom of commuting these appointed temporal penalties. . . . The practice of accepting offerings of money in the room of the ordinary forms of penance harmonized with the penal codes in vogue among the barbarian peoples. . . . By Aquinas, the priest is made the instrument of conveying the divine pardon, the vehicle through which the grace of God passes to the penitent. With the jubilees, or pilgrimages to Rome, ordained by the Popes, came the plenary indulgences, as the complete remission of all temporal penalties — that is, the penalties still obligatory on the penitent — on the fulfilment of prescribed conditions. These penalties might extend into purgatory, but the indulgence obliterated them all."

During last year was published the seventh volume of an extensive "History of the Christian Church," by Dr. Philip Schaff, which has already become a standard authority, because of its learning, its judicious tone, and its marked literary ability. This volume treats of the Reformation, and its definition of indulgences has been accepted by Catholics as a correct one.* Dr. Schaff also treats the subject somewhat historically:

"The difficult and complicated doctrine of indulgences is peculiar to the Roman Church. It was developed by the mediæval schoolmen, and sanctioned by the Council of Trent

* This definition of indulgences has not been accepted by Catholics as a correct one. See definition in the Catechism of the Council of Baltimore, page 24; also that given by Maurel, page 73; as well as that of Dens, page 88. The reader will notice that no mention is made in any of these approved definitions of the "payment of money to the church or some charitable object" as a requisite for obtaining an indulgence.

(Dec. 4, 1563), yet without a definition and with an express warning against abuses and evil gains.

"In ecclesiastical Latin, an indulgence means the remission of the temporal (not the eternal) punishment of sin (not of sin itself), on condition of penance and the payment of money to the Church or to some charitable object. It may be granted by a bishop or archbishop within his diocese, while the Pope has the power to grant it to all Catholics. The practice of indulgences grew out of a custom of the northern and western barbarians to substitute pecuniary compensation for punishment of an offence. The Church favored this custom in order to avoid bloodshed, but did wrong in applying it to *religious* offences. . . . The practice rapidly spread on the Continent, and was used by the Popes during and after the crusades, as a means of increasing their power. It was justified and reduced to a theory by the schoolmen, especially by Thomas Aquinas, in close connection with the doctrine of the sacrament of penance and priestly absolution.

"The sacrament of penance includes three elements, — contrition of the heart, confession of the mouth (to the priest), and satisfaction by good works, such as prayer, fasting, almsgiving, pilgrimages, all of which are supposed to have an atoning efficacy. God forgives only the eternal punishment of sin, and he alone can do that; but the sinner has to bear the temporal punishments, either in this life or in purgatory; and these punishments are under the control of the Church or the priesthood, especially the Pope as its legitimate head. There are also works of supererogation, performed by Christ and the saints, with corresponding extra merits and extra rewards, and these constitute a rich treasury from which the Pope, as the treasurer, can dispense indulgences for money. This papal power of dispensation extends even to the departed souls in purgatory, whose sufferings thereby may be abridged. This is the scholastic doctrine."

These Protestant definitions may be supplemented or corrected by one from a Catholic source. The standard Catholic authority on indulgences, at least in English, seems to be a work entitled "The Christian Instructed in the Nature and Use of Indulgences," by the Rev. A. Maurel. I will quote at some length from the chapter of this work devoted to the definition of an indulgence:

"Suppose the case of one who has had the misfortune of offending God. If the sin be mortal, the injury done to the Divine Majesty is grievous; consequently, this person has both lost sanctifying grace, and merited eternal chastisements. But should it be merely venial, the friendship of God is not lost, so that in this case he incurs only a temporal penalty. In the former supposition, the sacrament of penance, or an act of perfect contrition reconciles the sinner with his Creator, and obtains for him pardon as to the eternal punishment. But since a temporal penalty is ordinarily substituted for this eternal chastisement, the offender, though reconciled with God, must pay that fine either in this life by means of works of penance, or hereafter by the pains of purgatory.

"Blessed be God! by an inestimable benefit, whose worth and greatness are beyond expression, or as Bourdaloue says, by a favor calculated to call forth all the envy of demons against man, the Almighty graciously remits that debt by means of indulgences. In fact, indulgences are nothing else than this remission. At the very moment the sinner separates himself from God by sin, God may abandon and deliver him up to the rigor of his inexorable justice. But far from doing this, he says to him: 'Do penance, and you will thereby avert the arrows of my vengeance.' Not only that, but since the reconciliation of the soul to God by penance entails a length of painful sufferings which the transgressor must undergo in order to make satisfaction, our Divine Lord on that account vouchsafes to give up the strict right he has to exact such a penalty. Accordingly, to supply the insufficiency of the sinner's satisfaction, to facilitate the total expiation of his sins, and thus to complete his justification so to speak, through the hands of his church, he holds out to him a treasure of indulgences.

"An indulgence, then, is 'a remission of the temporal punishment for which the sinner remains indebted to the Divine Justice on account of sins already pardoned as to their guilt and eternal chastisement.' This remission is effected by means of the application of the satisfactions contained in the Spiritual Treasure of the Church; it takes place outside the sacrament of penance, but always in virtue of the power of the keys, that is, through the medium of those empowered to unlock and dispense this grand treasure. Hence an indulgence remits neither mortal sin, nor venial sin, nor the eternal chastisement; neither does it bring about or effect justification; on the contrary, it presupposes and follows it."

VI.

The Abuse of Indulgences.*

As an indulgence is thus defined, it would appear that Swinton misconceived its nature, if his statement that it was "represented as an actual pardon of guilt," applied to the direct teaching of the Church. As we have already seen, the Church never formulated its practice in regard to indulgences into a positive doctrine; and while Swinton states what the Church actually did, his assertion is not in harmony with its teachings.† But as Swinton undertakes in his foot-note to describe only what was performed by many Catholics, it is necessary to inquire into what was the Catholic practice at the period when Luther posted his ninety-five theses.

The writers already quoted recognize the abuses to which Swinton refers in his note, and which he accurately describes in saying that "indulgences were represented as actual pardons of guilt, and the purchaser of indulgence was said to be delivered from all his sins." These abuses are thus referred to by the "Encyclopedia Britannica," in the article already quoted: —

"The doctrine of indulgences is singularly open to misunderstanding; and in its practical applications it has too often been used to sanction the most flagrant immorality. The scandalous abuses connected with the 'pardoner's' trade, and in particular the reckless conduct of the hawkers of

* No one denies that bad men have at times abused indulgences. The Catholic Church acknowledges and deplores that fact; and, as soon as such abuses have come to her knowledge, she has used every means to reform and remedy the evil. Does Mr. Cooke mean to argue that because indulgences have been at times abused, therefore they ought to be abolished altogether as in themselves bad? By the same line of reasoning, every good thing would have to be abolished; for there is nothing good which cannot be, and at times has not been, abused. — R. J. J.

† Why, then, on page 86, does Mr. Cooke positively assure us that "the foot-note in Swinton is perfectly true in every particular"?— R. J. J.

papal indulgence granted by those who should contribute to the funds for the completion of St. Peter's, Rome, were, as is well known, very prominent among the proximate causes of the Protestant Reformation."

In speaking of the sale of indulgences at the time of Luther, Prof. Fisher says:

"The business of selling indulgences had grown by the profitableness of it. . . . As managed by Tetzel and the other emissaries sent out to collect money for the building of St. Peter's Church, the indulgence was a simple bargain, according to which, on the payment of a stipulated sum, the individual received a full discharge from the penalties of sin, or procured the release of a soul from the flames of purgatory. The forgiveness of sins was offered in the market for money.

"The granting of indulgences degenerated, after the time of the crusades, into a regular traffic, and became a source of ecclesiastical and monastic wealth. . . . The rebuilding of St. Peter's Church in Rome furnished an occasion for the periodical exercise of the papal power of granting indulgences. Julius II. and Leo X., two of the most worldly, avaricious, and extravagant popes, had no scruple to raise funds for that object, and incidentally for their own aggrandizement, from the traffic in indulgences. Both issued several bulls to that effect."

Dr. Schaff thus describes the methods pursued by Tetzel in the sale of indulgences in Saxony:

"Tetzel travelled with great pomp and circumstance through Germany, and recommended with unscrupulous effrontery and declamatory eloquence the indulgences of the pope to the large crowds who gathered from every quarter around him. He was received like a messenger from heaven. Priests, monks, and magistrates, men and women, old and young, marched in solemn procession with songs, flags, and candles, under the ringing of bells, to meet him and his fellow monks, and follow them to the church. The papal bull on a velvet cushion was placed on the high altar, a red cross, with silken banner bearing the papal arms, was erected before it, and a larger iron chest was put beneath the cross for the indulgence money. The preachers, by daily sermons,

hymns, and processions, urged the people, with extravagant laudations of the Pope's bull, to purchase letters of indulgence for their own benefit, and at the same time played upon their sympathies for departed relatives and friends whom they might release from their sufferings in purgatory 'as soon as the penny tinkles in the box!'"

Leopold von Ranke is usually accepted as the greatest of church historians. He is never sectarian, but he is always moderate and perfectly fair.* In his "History of the Papacy" he refers to the vast evil which was created by the sale of indulgences, and to the worldly tendency it everywhere produced in the Church. This is his statement, which does not exaggerate, but plainly shows how great the corruption:

"The fact that the German assault on the Roman Church was first directed against the abuses arising from the sale of indulgences, has sometimes been regarded as mere matter of accident; but as the alienation of that which is most essentially spiritual, involved in the doctrine of indulgences, laid open and gave to view the weakest point in the whole system — that worldliness of spirit now prevalent in the Church — so was it, of all things, best calculated to shock and offend the convictions of those earnest and profound thinkers, the German theologians. A man like Luther, whose religion was sincere and deeply felt, whose opinions of sin and justification were those propounded by the early German theologians, and confirmed in his mind by the study of Scripture, which he had drunk with a thirsting heart, could not

* A distinction is here necessary to be made. Milman, Von Ranke, Fisher, and Schaff are all historians who view history through the lens of Protestantism. They are avowed Protestant writers, who do not believe in Catholic doctrines and have no sympathy with the Catholic Church, its teachings, or its practices. They cannot, therefore, be quoted as Mr. Cooke attempts to quotes them, as if their dicta on historical questions touching the Catholic Church had that quality of judicial impartiality which commends them to universal acceptance. Such is not the case. Admitting their Protestant bias, they may be properly ranked by Protestants as high-toned and fair writers, but by Catholics they certainly will not be accepted as authorities on matters concerning Catholic history and doctrine. — R. J. J.

fail to be revolted and shocked by the sale of indulgences. Forgiveness of sins to be purchased for money! This must, of necessity, be deeply offensive to him, whose conclusions were drawn from profound contemplation of the eternal relation subsisting between God and man, and who had learned to interpret Scripture for himself."

Whatever the formulated teaching of the Church, the people believed in indulgences as direct pardons of sin.* This is very clearly pointed out by Dean Milman, another able church historian, who says:

"Long before Luther this abuse had rankled in the heart of Christendom. It was in vain for the Church to assert that, rightly understood, indulgences only released from temporary penances; that they were a commutation, a merciful, lawful commutation for such penances. The language of the promulgators and vendors of the indulgences, even of the indulgences themselves, was, to the vulgar ear, the broad, plain, direct guarantee from the pains of purgatory, from hell itself, for tens, hundreds, thousands of years; a sweeping pardon for all sins committed, a sweeping license for sins to be committed; and if this false construction, it might be, was perilous to the irreligious, this even seeming flagrant dissociation of morality from religion was no less revolting to the religious."

As Dean Milman says, the very wording of the absolution given the purchaser of indulgence led the people to believe that they were buying a full pardon for sin. This may be seen in the absolution used by Tetzel, and which appears in translation in Robertson's "History of the Reign of the Emperor Charles V.":

"May our Lord Jesus Christ have mercy upon thee and absolve thee by the merits of His most holy passion. And I, by His authority, that of His apostles Peter and Paul, and of most holy Pope, granted and committed to me in these parts, do absolve thee, first, from all ecclesiastical censures, in what-

* If the term "the people" is meant to include Catholics, this statement is not true. Catholic people never believed indulgences were pardons for sin.

ever manner they have been incurred, and then from all thy sins, transgressions, and excesses, how onerous soever they may be, even from such as are reserved for the cognizance of the Holy See; and as far as the keys of the Holy Church extend, I remit to you all punishment which you deserve in purgatory on their account; and I restore you to the holy sacraments of the Church, to the unity of the faithful, and to that innocence and purity which you possessed at baptism; to that when you die the gates of punishment shall be shut, and the gates of paradise and delight shall be opened; and if you shall not die at present this grace shall remain in full force when you are at the point of death. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." *

In the first volume of his book on "The Rise of the Dutch Republic," Motley has described the practical effects of the sale of indulgences: †

"The sale of absolutions was the source of large fortunes to the priests. The enormous impudence of this traffic almost exceeds belief. Throughout the Netherlands the price current of the wares thus offered for sale was published in every town and village. God's pardon for crimes already committed, or about to be committed, was advertised according to a graduated tariff. Thus, poisoning, for example, was absolute for eleven ducats, six livres tournois. Absolution for incest was afforded at thirty-six livres, three ducats. Perjury came to seven livres and three carlines. Pardon for murder, if not by poison, was cheaper. Even a parricide could buy forgiveness at God's tribunal at one

* There is no evidence that any document, in the form here quoted, was ever issued by Tetzel. The Protestant historian, Sir Francis Palgrave, classifies Robertson in the list of dishonest and unfair writers. He says: "Never do these writers, or their school, whether in France or Great Britain, Voltaire or Mably, Hume, Robertson, or Henry, treat the clergy or the church with fairness; not even common honesty. If historical notoriety enforces the allowance of any merit to a priest, the effect of this extorted acknowledgment is destroyed by a clever insinuation or a coarse innuendo." — Preface to *History of Normandy and England.* See page 145. — R. J. J.

† It is sufficient to put over against Motley the declaration of Prof. Fisher, of Yale College: "To say that the Roman Catholic Church has ever taught that the forgiveness of sins can be bought with money, is an atrocious slander." (See page 147.) — R. J. J.

ducat, four livres, eight carlines. Henry de Montfort, in the year 1448, purchased absolution for that crime at that price. Was it strange that a century or so of this kind of work should produce a Luther? Was it unnatural that plain people, who loved the ancient church, should rather desire to see her purged of such blasphemous abuses than to hear of St. Peter's dome rising a little nearer to the clouds on these proceeds of commuted crime?"

That the Church itself approved of what is here described, I do not wish to assert; but undeniably these things were done in the name of the Church. The people believed in indulgences as actual pardons of sin, and they were sold to them with the assurance that they were such.

Whatever the theory of the Church, indulgences were accepted as permissions to sin, and everything connected with their sale confirmed this belief on the part of the great mass of the people. That careful and very tolerant writer, the Rev. Dr. Hedge, has put into a few words what I believe is the exact truth in the matter:

"Penitence was nominally required of the sinner, but proofs of penance were not exacted. *Practically, the indulgence meant impunity for sin.* A more complete travesty of the gospel — laughable if not so impious — could hardly be conceived. The faithful themselves were shocked by the shameless realism which characterized the proclamations of the German commissioner, Tetzel." *

What Luther did and said can have no meaning whatever, if indulgences were not generally sold "as actual pardons of

* Rev. C. C. Starbuck, a Protestant authority already quoted, in his letter to the *Christian Mirror* (April 20, 1889), on this question, says: "Dr. Hedge's presentation is just as nearly wrong end foremost as it could easily be. It seems to have been derived from the depths of the literary consciousness, and that is a very insecure dependence for accuracy in presentations of Roman Catholic doctrine." Mr. Starbuck adds, that Dr. Hedge's statement concerning the doctrine of indulgences "would furnish much matter of amusement to any intelligent boy or girl who had gone through DeDharbe's Catechism, or any equivalent one, under a competent instructor." — R. J. J.

guilt." The Reformation is without an explanation, if "the purchaser of indulgence was not said to be delivered from all sins." It was the universal traffic in indulgences, the open and shameless sale of them as covering crime, which aroused the reformers everywhere and caused the division of the Church.* History cannot be gainsaid. The facts are too patent to all intelligent readers.

GEORGE W. COOKE.

THE DEFENCE CONTINUED.

THIRD LETTER OF THE REV. GEORGE W. COOKE.

[From the Dedham *Standard*, Feb. 2, 1889.]

VII.

Catholic Testimony to the Abuse of Indulgences.

It is not necessary to rely on Protestant authors only, in order to prove that indulgences were sold as pardons of guilt. The Catholic writers of the Reformation era, and since, have given the same testimony as their Protestant neighbors.

The greatest scholar of that period, Erasmus, who remained a Catholic at heart, though sometimes in sympathy with the reformers, spoke of indulgences, in his "Praise of Folly," as "the crime of false pardons." In writing to Colet, the English scholar, he said:

"The Court of Rome clearly has lost all sense of shame; for what could be more shameless than these continued indulgences?"

At another time he wrote:

"Everywhere the remission of purgatorial torment is sold; nor is it sold only, but forced upon those who refuse it."

---

* Dr. Schaff, whom Mr. Cooke considers very high authority, says, on the contrary, that the Reformation would have come to pass if Tetzel had never lived, and that it had no connection with indulgences. (See page 151.) —R. J. J.

A Catholic historian, Maimbourg, thus asserts the fact of indulgences being sold as pardons of guilt:

"Some of these preachers did not fail, as usual, to distort their subject, and so to exaggerate the value of the indulgences as to lead the people to believe that as soon as they gave their money they were certain of salvation, and of the deliverance of souls from purgatory."

Maurel, in his book on indulgences, attempts to defend the methods adopted by Leo X., which he claims were quite innocent and honorable; but he is obliged to end his statement by saying:

"No doubt some shocking abuses unfortunately crept into the mode of collecting or receiving these alms."

Adrian VI., the successor in the papal chair to Leo X., was an honest, noble man, and did all he could to promote reform in the Church. This was his testimony in regard to the evils of the time, as he is quoted by Ranke and other historians:

"These disorders sprang from the sins of men, more especially from the sins of priests and prelates. Even in the holy chair many horrible crimes have been committed. The contagious disease, spreading from the head to the members, from the Pope to lesser prelates, has spread far and wide, so that scarcely any one is to be found who does right and who is free from infection."

In the Prologue to his "Canterbury Tales," Chaucer describes the pardoner:

> "His wallet lay before him in his lap
> Brim-full of pardons come from Rome all hot;
> And thus with fained flattering and japes,
> He made the parsons and the people his apes."

The testimony of Luther, who was still decidedly a Catholic when he nailed the theses to the church door, may not be out of place here as to the way in which indulgences were sold. He wrote to the archbishop to complain of Tetzel and his co-workers, in these most suggestive words:

"I complain bitterly of the fatal errors in which these men are involving the common people, men of weak understanding, whom, foolish as they are, these men persuade that they will be sure of salvation if they only buy their letters of plenary indulgence. They believe that souls will fly out of purgatory the moment that the money paid for their redemption is thrown into the preacher's bag, and that such virtue belongs to these indulgences that there is no sin which the indulgences will not absolutely and at once efface."

This explicit statement of Luther's is very interesting, for it tells us distinctly what at first was the ground of his complaint, and why he attacked the sellers of indulgence. It was because they were deceiving the uneducated people, and making of religion a mere traffic.

VIII.

The Sale of Indulgences still Continued.

The Church has not changed its doctrine of indulgence since the Reformation. What it taught then, it teaches now; and indulgences are still sold.* That the sale of indulgences is abused now as in the time of Luther, and centuries before, no one will maintain.

In Chicago, not long since, there appeared in a Catholic paper, the following advertisement: —

"PLENARY INDULGENCES

"THAT MAY BE GAINED IN THE HOLY FAMILY CHURCH.

"For sodality members, on the days of meeting, on Communion Sundays, on the feast of the assumption."

In the Boston *Globe*, last autumn, appeared the following item of news:

"In all the Catholic churches throughout the world a special mass and office was celebrated yesterday, by order of Leo XIII., in order to further the devotion of the holy rosary.

* Yet on page 45, Mr. Cooke clearly appears to hold a contrary opinion, for he there says: "What the Catholic Church teaches now is not the question in controversy, but what it taught at the time of Luther." — R. J. J.

The month of October is especially devoted to Our Lady of the Rosary, and the rosary is publicly recited every evening in all Catholic churches. A plenary indulgence is granted to all those who attend the devotions and comply with the necessary conditions."

If a correspondent of the *Christian Register* can be trusted, the sale of indulgences in Italy, even to-day, stands in need of reformation. Augusta Larned, in the issue of that paper for Aug. 16, 1888, in an article entitled "At Bologna, Milan, and Como," describes a visit to the Church of San Petronio at Bologna, and concludes by saying:

"By the declining light of day, I saw on the front of the old church something that proved an eyesore and an offence to my Protestant soul. There, boldly placarded for all men to read, was the announcement that plenary indulgences were sold within. I found, on inquiry, that Bologna is quite the centre of this old abomination. In the little villages round about a priest appears on stated occasions, rings a bell, and announces to the people that full and free pardon for major sins is granted for half a crown, and venial offences are condoned for eighteen pence English. At least, this was what I was told; and I have little reason to doubt it. Surely, Tetzel still lives, and another Luther is in great and immediate demand."

I give the above quotation for what it is worth. If the accounts which come to us from Italy, of the abject condition in which the common people are held in that country by the priests, have any truth in them, we may well believe that the old misrepresentation of indulgences still lingers.*

* Where does Mr. Cooke get his accounts of the "abject condition" in which the common people of Italy are held by the priests? This is undoubtedly another example of his eager credulity that forms a staple feature of the no-Popery leaflets. Gorres, a German scholar of high repute, speaking of the influence of their religion on the Italian peasantry, says: "This feeling of propriety, which restrains their natural vivacity within the bounds of decorum, renders intercourse with the most uncultivated classes agreeable. The ingenuous and open character of the peasantry has a most becoming exterior, and elevates them far above the rustic manners and

The other quotations are entirely in harmony with the teachings of the Church. Maurel's book on indulgences devotes two hundred pages to the various methods by which they may be obtained. Whatever the method of obtaining them, the Catholic regards indulgences as perfectly trustworthy in their nature. "It is infallibly certain," says Maurel, "that the faithful on earth obtain the fruit of an indulgence which the Church makes applicable to the living."

Not only does the Church ensure the certainty of an indulgence, but it insists that it must be paid for by the faithful. "The prelates of the Church," says Maurel, "even the popes themselves, are not such absolute masters as to be able, at pleasure, *and without any compensation*, to remit or cover the transgressions and penalties for which sinners are answerable before the Sovereign Judge." Again, we learn that, "when a priest, in the tribunal of penance, absolves a penitent from his faults and a part of the temporal penalty, he does not do so *without any compensation*." The money thus obtained is devoted to church purposes, for we are told that when "the vicars of Christ" sell indulgences, "they invite us to contribute towards the propagation of the faith in distant pagan countries; to take part in so charitable and holy a work as the baptism of children belonging to the Chinese or Indians; to procure the conversion of sinners through the intercession of the Immaculate Heart of Mary; to induce the people to enroll themselves in the Associations of the Blessed Sacrament; or in the confraternities of Holy Mary; to en-

uncouthness of the corresponding class in other countries. Their strong natural sense renders them so accurate in their judgment and so just in their principles that if we abstract positive scientific knowledge, which they cannot be supposed to possess, and look only to the relations of society, little more would be necessary to transform them into noblemen than to change their outward garb." This is the testimony of a scholar, based on his own personal observations among the Italian people, and it may with confidence be set against the trivial tattle which Mr. Cooke gives us on hearsay. — R. J. J.

courage devout pilgrimages; to frequent the sacraments; to assist the poor souls in purgatory," etc., etc.

The Church makes it very easy to obtain indulgences. For instance, *every time* a person recites, with a contrite heart, a prescribed invocation to Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, he receives an indulgence for three hundred days. Every time a person repeats the pious ejaculation, "My Jesus, mercy!" he obtains an indulgence of one hundred days. The recitation of the "Stabat Mater," with devotion, gives an indulgence of one hundred days. Whenever a person, truly penitent, makes the sign of the cross, saying, "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," an indulgence of fifty days is gained. An indulgence of four hundred days is given to those who, being contrite in heart, after confession, on Corpus Christi day, piously assist at mass. A great number of similar indulgences may be obtained, under like conditions. Also a large number of special indulgences are given to churches, societies, and particular objects. One of the societies having special privileges is the "Confraternity of the Rosary"; and those connected with it have special indulgences granted them after the recitation of prayers on the rosary. "Few confraternities in the Church," says Maurel, "are more extensively propagated than that of the rosary or more productive of salutary results. Furthermore, as the conditions exacted by it are so easy to be fulfilled, every Catholic ought to be delighted to enlist under its banner. The chief condition for each member is to recite the entire rosary at least once a week, meditating on the fifteen mysteries, accompanied with some appropriate reflections." "To become a member of the confraternity," we are also told, "the only formality requisite is to have one's name inscribed in the registry belonging to the society. A person ought to take care to have his rosary or chaplet blessed by a Dominican Father

or by a priest who may have received the power from the Pope directly, or from the Very Rev. Superior-General of the order of Friars Preachers. Otherwise the indulgences could not be gained."

This is to be remembered in regard to indulgences, that they are wholly under the control of the priesthood.* However benevolently used, they are a powerful lever for gaining money. The layman must accept the priest's terms, and the priest is careful to commend the wonderful efficacy of the indulgence. However honest the Church may be, the association of anything so thoroughly believed in as the indulgence is by Catholics, with monetary conditions, must be always open to more or less of abuse.

From the facts now presented, it would appear that the foot-note in Swinton is perfectly true in every particular.† If one historian can confirm the statements of another, then Swinton's foot-note is confirmed by a consensus of all the competent historians. GEORGE W. COOKE.

THE REV. R. J. JOHNSON REPLIES.

THE TRUTH ABOUT INDULGENCES. — THE CATHOLIC CHURCH NEVER TAUGHT THAT THEY WERE PARDONS OF GUILT OR A LICENSE TO COMMIT SIN.

[From the Dedham *Standard*, Feb. 9, 1889.]

Your readers have no doubt had as much entertainment as myself in reading the recent letters by your correspondent, the Rev. George W. Cooke, on "The School Controversy."

---

* This is utterly untrue. No priest has the power to grant an indulgence, or to make any terms or conditions in relation to it. (See page 142.) — R. J. J.

† Nevertheless, on page 74, Mr Cooke declares with equal firmness that Swinton's assertion is not in harmony with its (the Church's) teaching. — R. J. J.

It was not my intention to intrude upon his studies in history or to offer any remarks upon their results until he had concluded his course. But I see that he is wandering farther and farther away from the point in issue between us, and feel, therefore, that unless some limit be set to his cyclic disquisitions upon unrelated topics, we shall never reach a conclusion.

Let me recall to his attention and that of the general reader exactly what the point at issue is. It is simply whether Swinton in his "Outlines" gives a correct definition of indulgences; that is to say, is it true that the Catholic Church ever represented an indulgence as a "pardon of guilt" or ever authorized or sanctioned the teaching that "the purchaser of indulgence" was "delivered from all his sins"?

Up to this time, though he has written several long letters about and around it, your correspondent has not yet addressed himself to this one vital point. I looked for him to show some proof for the statement that indulgences were represented by the Catholic Church as "actual pardons of guilt"; whether by documents issuing from the Pope, either personally or by a council. I wait in vain for him to produce the first fragment of evidence of this kind. Surely he must see that the accuracy of Swinton's definition of indulgences, which he pledged himself to show, cannot be established by anything short of quotations from the authoritative utterances of the Catholic Church. Again and again in his letters, your correspondent asserts that Mr. Swinton's statement of the matter is correct. Of course it is open to him to repeat this assertion as often as he likes; but it is an empty reiteration, and it would not advance his argument. It is proofs and authorities that we want, not assertions.

In attempting to recall your correspondent to the real question at issue, let me state once more what an indulgence

is, as the Catholic Church teaches it. Dens and other theologians define an indulgence as follows:

"An indulgence is a remission of the temporal punishment due to sins remitted as to their guilt; granted by the power of the keys, externally to the sacrament, by an application of the satisfactions which are contained in the treasury of the Church."

Such is the definition given by an approved theologian, a definition which is substantially identical with what the Church has held from the days of the early fathers down through the days of the schoolmen to our own times.

To suppose, indeed, that in any state of civilized society either "license of sinning," or absolution for having sinned, could be publicly recognized as venal, and offered for sale by the lawfully constituted authorities, would seem to be little short of absurdity; and few persons, unless blinded by prejudice, could honestly entertain the supposition. Such a system, in practical operation, would be subversive of society, to say nothing of religion. But your correspondent does not seem to have thought it at all necessary to resort to first-hand authorities. No wonder then that the discussion has been unintelligent. He cannot know what the Catholic Church teaches an indulgence to be, except by reference to the documents in which her doctrines are declared. These documents are in existence, and they were closely scanned by the leaders of the Reformation, and none of them has made the charge that the doctrine of indulgences was taught by the Catholic Church to be "a pardon of guilt," or that "the purchaser of indulgence was said to be delivered from all his sins." The severest critics of the Catholic Church have not charged her in the worst times with any attempt to remove the doctrinal foundations of Christianity. From the beginning to the end of the discussion by Luther on indulgences, he nowhere insists, or even intimates, that any dreamed-of indulgence is a license to commit sin.

Prof. Charles Kendall Adams, whom your correspondent calls "the highest historical authority we have in this country," says on this point:

"Luther was so far from condemning indulgences that the seventy-first of his famous ninety-five theses pronounced a curse upon any one who should question their truth or value."

No reputable historian would make such a serious charge against the Catholic Church without citing some support for it from the recognized official teaching of the Church itself. There is not, in fact, the slightest foundation for such a charge, neither in the creeds, the decrees of councils, the dogmatic definitions of the Popes, the catechisms, or the teachings of theologians. Does any ground for it exist? Tetzel's exaggerations on this subject are disputed by no one, but it is to be noted that even Tetzel, in his instructions to the German priesthood, enjoined on the clergy to impress on the people that indulgences would do no good unless after repentance and absolution. Not even Tetzel misrepresented the doctrine itself; indeed, he took particular pains that the doctrine should not be misrepresented. Even Dr. Schaff, viewing the subject from a Protestant stand-point (page 152, Vol. VI., of his "Church History"), says:

"We must judge him (Tetzel) from his published sermons and his 'Antitheses' against Luther. They teach neither more nor less than the usual scholastic doctrine of indulgence, based upon an extravagant theory of papal authority. He does not ignore, as is often asserted, the necessity of repentance as a condition of absolution, but he probably did not emphasize it in practice, and gave rise, by unguarded expressions, to damaging stories."

In a pastoral letter, addressed to the members of his diocese, and fixed on the door of every church where indulgences were granted, Albert, Archbishop of Mayence, formally declared that in order to participate in the spiritual graces which the Pope offered to all, it was imperative, in the first

instance, to confess their sins, and then to mourn and redeem them by voluntary penance.

Prof. Fisher, writing in the *Congregationalist* of July 5, 1888, in an able article on indulgences, says, after explaining the doctrine at some length:

"The foregoing explanations will show that no teacher in the Church of Rome, who is intelligent and honest, and no good man, would regard with any other feeling than abhorrence the idea of giving a man permission to commit an act which was recognized as a sin, or absolve a man beforehand from the penances which would follow such an act, if he were to do it and then to repent of it."

Indeed your correspondent himself, by his own quotations from standard works, proves that an indulgence was not taught by the Church to be "a pardon of guilt." He quotes Dr. Schaff to this effect:

"In ecclesiastical Latin, an indulgence means the remission of the temporal (not the eternal) punishment of sin (not of sin itself), on condition of penance," etc.

Cardinal Wiseman, writing on indulgences, says:

"Do I then mean to say, that during the Middle Ages, and later, no abuse took place in the practice of indulgences? Most certainly not. Flagrant and too frequent abuses, doubtless, occurred through the avarice, rapacity, and impiety of men; especially when indulgence was granted to the contributors toward charitable or religious foundations, in the erection of which private motives too often mingle. But the Church ever felt, and ever tried to remedy, the evil. These abuses were most strongly condemned by Innocent III., in the Council of Lateran in 1139; by Innocent IV., in that of Lyons in 1245; and still more pointedly and energetically by Clement V., in the Council of Vienna in 1311. The Council of Trent, by an ample decree, completely reformed the abuses which had subsequently crept in, and had been unfortunately used as a ground for Luther's separation from the Church. But even in those ages the real force and the requisite conditions of indulgences were well understood."

I will not dwell any longer upon the historical facts of the case. For those who want to know the truth they are plain enough. For those who merely seek an occasion and a pretext to abuse the Catholic Church, nothing that I could say would suffice; they will not accept such authorities, and such Protestant authorities as have been already quoted, — Prof. Fisher, Dr. Schaff, and the standard encyclopedias. For them no historical facts would be of any avail. A correspondent who does not know the difference between an indulgence and the Inquisition, and who jumbles absolution, indulgence, and penance together, will none the less confidently write long letters on the teaching of the Catholic Church in regard to any point of doctrine. A Protestant minister, Rev. Dr. R. Court, of Lowell, discussing the same question with another Protestant divine, Rev. Mr. Blackburn, in the Lowell *Times* of July 20, 1888, says that "Protestant historians have confounded absolution with indulgence and indulgence with dispensation, as is well known to every student of history who is also well acquainted with Roman Catholic theology." There are large numbers of people who know nothing about Catholic doctrines, and yet who lay down the laws thereon, and expatiate upon truths of which they have not a glimmering of understanding. Such people say, "I do not believe in this or that, and what I do not believe in is false."

Your correspondent has had much to say about the sale of indulgences. Bishop England, discussing this question, says:

"As to the sale of indulgences, we allow and admit freely, that bad men have committed abuses. But there is what we will admit to be a mistake upon the minds of many persons as to this practice. A sale means the giving of one commodity for another. Now, money or other commodities may frequently be given with particular dispositions, not to purchase spiritual effects, which no money could purchase, but to please the Lord, and yet a spiritual advantage will be ob-

tained. Thus, when the Scripture informs us that 'alms-deeds release from sin,' we do not believe the money purchases the pardon of the sin in the sense ordinarily attached to sale and purchase. Thus, when the prophet Daniel tells the king, 'Redeem thy sins with alms, and thy iniquities with works of mercy to the poor, and perhaps God will forgive thy offences,' we do not understand a purchase and a sale. Thus, when Christian preachers exhort their flocks to alms-deeds, and assure them that 'he who giveth to the poor, lendeth to the Lord, and that the Lord will repay him,' we do not accuse them of selling pardons. So with indulgences. When the Church tells us that by alms-deeds we may obtain the mercy of Christ, to remit even the temporal punishment to which we remain liable, after we have by repentance and mercy obtained pardon of our sins, it is not a sale and purchase; it is but the application of the same principle which pervades the new law and the old.

"But as alms-deeds are not the only mode pointed out in the Scripture for the obtaining pardon of sins, so they are not the only mode pointed out for the obtaining of indulgences. Prayer, visiting the sick, instructing the ignorant, receiving the sacraments, and such like practices of piety, are equally as alms-deeds the condition of indulgences. . . . We acknowledge that bad men did at different times abuse the doctrine of indulgences by endeavoring to impose upon the faithful in promising effects from indulgences which the Church never promised. We also acknowledge that several abuses of the power did frequently take place, but the Church uniformly condemned the impostors and labored to suppress the abuses. She, then, is not accountable for the misconduct of those whom she condemns, more than any State in this Union is accountable for the frauds of the villains who may be found among its citizens. Nor is she answerable for the abuses which she has endeavored to suppress, as the State is not answerable for the pettifogging chicanery and fraud which is committed under the semblance of law, but which is in direct opposition to the spirit of the law, though covered by the letter."

But Mr. Cooke condemns the Church for what she herself condemns, and imputes to her what she herself disclaims.

Archbishop Spaulding, speaking about selling indulgences, says:

"The granting of the indulgence, even according to the avowedly unauthorized practice of Tetzel, did not justify the idea of a sale or traffic properly so called. The offering made on the occasion was entirely free; those who were unable to contribute anything still obtained the coveted boon; and those who were able contributed according to their ability or will, no fixed amount being determined."

Your correspondent has much to say in his letters about the corruptions of the Catholic Church in Luther's day. He would almost lead us to believe that all the good people of that time left the Catholic Church and became reformers. He is constantly telling us of the corrupt state of morals that existed in some Catholic countries during the period that preceded the revolt of Luther. He appears to be ignorant of the fact that the reformers themselves declared that matters were not improved, but were made worse, by the spread of the reformed doctrines. The limits of my letter will not permit any extended quotation; but among those who testified on this point, Luther himself declares:

"I hold that they who have become Evangelicals have become worse than they were before they received the gospel. Unfortunately, it is our daily experience, that those who live under our gospel are more spiteful, more passionate, more greedy, avaricious, and quarrelsome, than ever they were under the Papacy." (Walch's edition of Luther's works, Vol. XIII., pages 2193, 2195.)

I must confess that I am at a loss to understand what the motive or purpose of your correspondent can be in doing such violence to the plainly expressed meaning of an author as he does by omitting a qualifying clause in quoting, in his last week's letter, from the Rev. A. Maurel's book on "Indulgences." He first quotes Maurel as saying that "it is infallibly certain that the faithful on earth obtain the fruit of an indulgence which the Church makes applicable to the living." Now, mark the unfairness of the quotation. A complete

sentence on page 32 of Maurel's book is broken in upon at a comma point, and the omitted clause that precedes the quoted portion completely changes the sense of what follows. The violence thus done to Maurel will be shown by a glance at the parallel columns:

MAUREL AS MUTILATED BY YOUR CORRESPONDENT.	MAUREL AS HE IS.
"It is infallibly certain that the faithful on earth obtain the fruit of an indulgence which the Church makes applicable to the living."	"All obstacles being removed, it is infallibly certain that the faithful on earth obtain the fruit of an indulgence which the Church makes applicable to the living."

The intelligent reader will at once perceive that the omitted first clause in your correspondent's quotation, "All obstacles being removed," makes all the difference in the world in the meaning of Maurel's declaration.

Maurel, in the paragraph just before this, had said that the Church "nevertheless confers them (indulgences) only within fixed limits on certain occasions, and for legitimate reasons." And Maurel, in many parts of his book, insists that an indulgence is never granted except when sin has first been the subject of sincere repentance and contrition; and that then it only applies to the temporal punishment due to sin after the eternal guilt and punishment thereof have been forgiven. On the same page from which your correspondent takes a mutilated sentence, Maurel says:

"But recollect, she (the Church) advances payment at the same time she absolves; in other words, from the inexhaustible mine or treasure composed of the satisfaction of Christ and the Saints, she takes a portion equivalent in value to the indulgence accorded, and applies it to the repentant sinner, saying to him, at least in effect: 'Behold, my child, you have been released from a part, or the entire of the punishment due to your sins; your debt has been totally or partially liquidated; Jesus Christ, the Blessed Virgin, and the Saints, have satisfied for you; be sure to testify your gratitude to them, particularly by the future amendment and innocence of your life.'"

How utterly unfair and misleading is your correspondent's quotation of this Catholic writer! He makes him represent an indulgence as a thing bought and sold for money, in view of Maurel's very explicit assertions to the contrary. Again he quotes from the same book on page 33 as follows: "When a priest, in the tribunal of penance, absolves a penitent from his faults and part of the temporal penalty, he does not do so without any compensation." He throws the last three words into large type, evidently to convey the idea that money payment is the prime condition of gaining an indulgence, but again he mutilates Maurel's text and meaning. He cuts a sentence in two, omitting in this case its concluding and explanatory portion, which reads as follows: "for, to satisfy the Divine justice, he applies to that soul the price of our Blessed Redeemer's precious blood." And to bring out the full meaning of Maurel, I will add what he says in the immediately following paragraphs:

"It is precisely the same in the case of indulgences, because through them as a means, the chief pastors of the Church remit the temporal penalties due to sin, by paying them, if the expression be allowable, with the satisfaction of Jesus Christ and his Saints. For the inspired words of the great Apostle admit of no exception: 'Without shedding of blood there is no remission.' (Heb. ix. 22.) This is also the reason why the Church, in granting indulgences, by no means intends to dispense us from every other obligation. Surely it is not her design thereby to release us from the obligation of doing penance, of carrying our cross in the footsteps of Christ, and of uniting our satisfaction to his; in fact, she could not dispense us from these all-important duties."

Maurel never says one word about "the vicars of Christ" selling indulgences, as your correspondent intimates.

He next quotes from page 40 of Maurel's book, and again mutilates the paragraph from which he quotes. He makes it appear that Maurel says the vicars of Christ "sell indulgences," and that in doing so they "invite us to contribute

towards the propagation of the faith in distant pagan countries," etc. But let us read the full text of this passage which he mangles from Maurel:

"Finally, it may be well to note that in *granting* (not selling) indulgences the vicars of Christ *grant* (not sell) them only for some pious ends that tend to advance the glory of God and the salvation of souls. Thus, for example, they invite us to contribute towards the propagation of the faith in distant pagan countries," etc.

If your correspondent had paused in his jump from page 33 to 40 he would have found Maurel declaring as follows on pages 36 and 37:

"It has been objected by certain heretics, and even by some Catholics unworthy of the name, that in unlocking her spiritual treasures for her children, the Church merely paves the way for relaxation. They have furthermore advanced that the bestowal of indulgences is only a permission to sin with impunity. We answer that this might be so, if, as our enemies blush not to affirm, indulgence exonerated us from the obligation of doing penance and of leading Christian lives. But, should the very reverse be the case, then we are justified in inferring that these rash, fickle-minded beings blasphemously comment on what they are totally ignorant of, or, at least, what they affect to ignore. We, moreover, emphatically assert, that the conditions to be fulfilled in order to gain indulgences would exact from most of these libertines sacrifices from which their corrupt nature would shrink with horror. . . .

"Yes, happily, it is beyond doubt that indulgences, be they what they may, are not obtained without a spirit of penance and a life of Christian virtue. As has been stated, an Indulgence remits neither sin itself nor its eternal penalty, but merely the temporal punishment not yet expiated. Now this chastisement can be remitted only to sinners already reconciled to God; because, while the sinner is at enmity with his Creator, there can be no indulgence for him, since our Lord will never cancel the penalty of sin as long as the sin itself subsists, or as long as the stain or guilt is not blotted out. But, pursuant to the Catholic teaching, which is expressly given down in the apostolic

bulls, an indulgence can be acquired only by a heart that is truly contrite and penitent. *Vere pœnitentibus et confessis, vere contritis* . . . by a soul in the friendship of God and adorned with his grace."

These extracts certainly suffice to show that your correspondent has grossly misrepresented the whole spirit and meaning of what Maurel has written on the subject of indulgences. With these corrections of his misstatement of that eminent Catholic writer, I leave him for the present.

I have left at the office of the *Standard* a copy of Maurel's book, so that your readers may verify these extracts for themselves. I reserve for later notice many other of your correspondent's strange assertions on this question, and the equally curious use he makes of other authorities whom he quotes.

The doctrine of indulgences is, I may remark in closing, one of the most frequently misunderstood and misrepresented of Catholic doctrines. The very name "indulgence" does something to mislead the non-Catholic mind. It is constantly misconstrued to mean a compounding with sin itself, and even with sin to be committed, whereas its meaning is exactly the reverse, a remission, namely, after sincere penance, of certain temporal penalties for sin, after the sin itself and its eternal penalty have been forgiven.

Misapprehensions as grave as those may be pardoned to honest ignorance; but there is no excuse for misrepresenting authorities. It is never the fair controversialist that has recourse to garbled quotations.

I conclude by summarizing some of Swinton's errors about indulgences.

1. Indulgences were never sold by authority of the Church.

2. The Dominican friars did not obtain a monopoly of the indulgences in Germany.

3. Tetzel was not the agent of the Dominican friars, but of the Archbishop of Mentz and Magdeburg.

4. Luther made no serious or genuine attempt to have the abuse of indulgences eliminated by the Archbishop of Magdeburg, as he posted up his theses almost at the same time that he sent his protest to the Archbishop.

5. Indulgences were never represented by the Church, nor even by Tetzel, as pardons of the guilt of sin, or of the eternal penalty.

6. The gainer of an indulgence was not said to be released from all his sins thereby, nor from any of them.

R. J. JOHNSON.

THE FACTS ABOUT SWINTON'S HISTORY.

LETTER OF THE REV. GEORGE W. COOKE.

[From the Dedham *Standard*, Feb. 9, 1889.]

IX.

History as taught by the Catholic Church.

The Catholics object to Swinton's "Outlines of History"; but what is it they would put in it place? When we have carefully considered that question, in the light of their own interpretation of history, it is easy to see that it is not Swinton to which they object, so much as the facts, which they would like to make other than they are. It is also perfectly evident, in the light of their own methods of teaching, that Swinton simply serves as an excuse for an attack on the public schools.

Would the Catholics substitute Anderson's "New Manual of General History" for that of Swinton? This they have done in Boston; but at the price of what dishonesty in the author? This work was first published as a "Manual of

General History," and it condemned the Catholics far more severely than does Swinton, however Swinton may be interpreted. In 1882 it was made over into the "New Manual," and in such a way as to approve it to Catholics. Every passage in the old book which condemned the teachings and acts of the Catholic Church is omitted from the new work. The old book said that under Louis IX., in France, "the Inquisition was established in Toulouse, and all who refused to conform to the tenets of the Church of Rome were mercilessly punished." In the new book this passage is omitted, because Catholics are very sensitive about the history of their Church. Another illustration of the changes made is quite significant. It is that where, in the old book, the reign of Philip II. is described as being noted for the persecution of the Albigenses, and in the new as being noted for the *rise* of the same people.

A careful comparison of the two works by Anderson makes it evident that he has deliberately suppressed his own opinions, in order to make a history acceptable to Catholics. This appears very clearly when we consider his treatment of the Reformation in the new volume. He does not attempt in any way to indicate the causes of the Reformation; these he utterly ignores. Nothing is said of abuses, indulgences, Leo X., or Tetzel. On page 598, in describing the reign of Maximilian I. in Germany, he says: "It was in this reign that Martin Luther published his famous ninety-five theses against the doctrines of the Catholic Church (1517)." That is the beginning and end of what he has to say about the opening of the Reformation, and the causes leading thereto. No explanation is given of the causes leading to Luther's act. Those who have read the theses of Luther must know that they were not directed against the *doctrines* of the Catholic Church, for Luther had not at this time rejected even one of the doctrines.

On page 599, Anderson informs the student that "From the spread of Luther's tenets grew what is called the Reformation. . . . Against the revocation of a decree of toleration (1529), fifteen imperial cities and seven reigning princes, including the Elector of Saxony, protested as being unjust and oppressive; and hence the followers of Luther were afterwards called Protestants." This is what we are told about one of the most momentous events in human history. One page is devoted to this great period! Why was it not passed over entirely, rather than misrepresent it as Anderson has done?

It is when we look into the books prepared for the parochial schools of the Catholic Church, that we learn how little regard Catholics have for the facts of history. I have carefully examined ten of these books, including readers, geographies, and histories. Among these are several of the most popular text-books now used in the parochial schools in this country. Some of them are very good books, conscientiously written and with an honest regard for truth; but all of them are written in the interests of Catholicism. They are written with the purpose, even the best of them, of making the Catholic Church appear to be the only true Church, and as the only genuine cause of progress and civilization in the world. In the Preface to the "Third Reader" of the Catholic National Series of Text-Books, we are told by the compiler, Bishop Gilmour, of Cleveland, that this book, in common with the other books of the series, "has one chief characteristic, viz., *a thoroughly Catholic tone*, which will be found to pervade the whole book." On examination this statement is found to be true, for from first to last it is evident the book was prepared with the purpose of imbuing the mind of the pupil with the Catholic conception of religion. Saints, nuns, masses, and miracles are repeatedly the subjects of the reading lessons; and they are spoken of with the

same confidence with which the Protestant would speak of Jesus Christ. The frontispiece to this book is a picture of the birds and beasts doing homage to St. Francis of Assisi; and it very well represents the general spirit of the book.

It is when we turn to the geographies and histories that we learn how the Catholics deal with history in the instruction of their children. Sadlier's "History of the United States" is a book prepared for the use of schools and colleges. In this book twenty-eight lines are devoted to Washington, and thirty-seven to Father Peter de Smet. Abraham Lincoln has thirty lines, and nearly fifty are given to Archbishop Hughes.* Certainly this method of dealing with history may have the effect of magnifying the Catholic Church; but it assuredly does not have the effect of keeping in mind the true balance and proportion of history. The perspective of history is utterly lost by this method, because it estimates a man by the standard of his church connections, and not by that of his real worth to civilization. That this book aims solely at the magnifying of the Church in the minds of the pupils, even at the expense of truth, may be readily understood by reading two of its statements. They are these: (1.) "The only systematic and successful attempts to civilize and christianize the Indians were made by Catholic missionaries." (2.) "The Independence of the United States was, in a great degree, secured by Catholic blood, talent, and treasure." Every kind of evidence necessary to prove the falsity of their statements is known to many intelligent persons. They are made in the interest of sectarianism, and their falsehood becomes all the more damnable for that reason.†

Another illustration of the way in which Catholics deal

* In Swinton's "World's History," the names of Washington and Lincoln are not even mentioned at all.

† See note, of the Appendix, on Catholic Indian Missions, page 219; also note, of the Appendix, on Catholic Aid to American Independence, page 222. — R. J. J.

with history is afforded by Sadlier's "Excelsior Introduction to Geography." This book was written by "a Catholic teacher," and it is intended for the use of those who are beginning the study of geography. On page 28 a lesson is devoted to the history and chief characteristics of the New England States. I will quote the whole of that part of the lesson devoted to the history of New England, as affording a striking illustration of how Catholics use history to strengthen the hold of their Church on the minds of children:

"What was the first settlement in the New England States? — Jesuit Mission on Mount Desert Island (in 1612).

"By whom was the settlement destroyed? — By the English.

"What people made a permanent settlement in Massachusetts in 1620? — The Pilgrim Fathers.

"Who were they? — English Protestants; who, being persecuted by their Protestant fellow countrymen, took refuge in America.

"How did they act in their new home? — They proved very intolerant, and persecuted all who dared to worship God in a manner different from that which they had established."

This very popular book in the parochial schools never loses an opportunity to magnify the Catholic Church and its priests. In the lesson on the history of the United States there are fifteen questions asked and answered, four of which relate to Catholicism, and are as follows:

"Who were the first explorers of great portions of our country? — Catholic missionaries.

"Who discovered and explored the Upper Mississippi? — Father Marquette, a Jesuit missionary.

"Where, in many of the States, were the first settlements formed? — Around the humble cross that marked the site of a Catholic Mission.

"What Catholic nation very materially assisted the Americans during the Revolutionary War? — France."

That one of this series of geographies prepared for ad-

vanced classes has the same conception of history as the primary work. On page 31 a brief history of each of the New England States is given. The following is, in full, what is said about the State of Maine:

"Maine, at the time of the discovery of America, was occupied by the Abnaki Indians.

"As early as 1612, a Jesuit mission for their conversion was founded in Mount Desert Island; but this settlement was soon afterwards destroyed by the English.

"About thirty years later, the Abnakis sent a deputation of chiefs to Quebec, to ask for a priest. Their petition was granted; and through the labors of Father Druillettes and other Jesuits, this powerful tribe was converted. Even to this day, the remnants of the tribe, occupying five villages in Canada and Maine, are all Catholics.

"Maine was admitted to the Union in 1820."

On page 87 of the same book, it is asserted of Switzerland, that since 1846 "the Catholic cantons have been deprived of freedom in religious matters." This statement is entirely untrue, for religious freedom is the law in all the cantons, and the Catholics have all the privileges accorded to Protestants. This, I suppose, is in harmony with the statement of the Preface of this book, that it has been prepared to supply a long-felt "want of a perfectly truthful geography, one that would deal fairly and justly with Catholic countries and Catholic peoples." *

Another series of Catholic text-books is the "Comprehensive Geographies." In the second book of this series, sixty-three lines are devoted to the history of the United States, but thirty of them are given to the Catholic Church. This is the way in which the deeds of the Church are magnified:

"Maryland was settled by Catholics in 1634. They were the first in the New World to proclaim equal rights to all who professed to be Christians.

* See note, of the Appendix, on Oppression of the Catholic Church in Switzerland, page 226.

"Catholic missionaries, fired with zeal for the conversion of the Indians, came in great numbers from Europe.

"The lives of these missionaries are full of the most heroic deeds. To convert the Indians they endured the greatest hardships and privations, and many of them suffered cruel deaths.

"They explored the country from north to south and from east to west; discovered rivers, lakes, and waterfalls.

"They printed and published the first books in America; introduced the orange, the vine, and the sugar-cane at the South; raised the first wheat crops in Illinois; discovered the salt springs of New York, and the oil springs of Pennsylvania."

It is not at all true, however, that equal rights in Maryland came because of the tolerant spirit of the Catholics, but because they could not secure a charter on any other terms than those which gave full recognition to the rights of Protestants.*

The third book of this series, page 13, attributes every good thing which has been produced in Europe to the Catholic Church. "All the great events that have permanently influenced the world's history cluster around it, and on its influence were directly or indirectly dependent." Here are the eleven great labors accomplished by the Catholic Church, as enumerated in this book:

"1. The establishment of the chair of St. Peter at Rome. 2. The triumph of Constantine. 3. The conversion of the Franks. 4. The establishment of the religious orders. 5. The foundation of universities and great seats of learning. 6. The triumph of Pope Gregory VIII. over Henry IV. of Germany. 7. The crusades. 8. The extinction of slavery in Europe. 9. The independence of the Italian cities, secured by the resistance of Pope Alexander III. to the Emperor Barbarossa. 10. The discovery of America, due mainly to the profound faith of Columbus and the piety of Queen Isabella. 11. Society in Europe, threatened both

* See note on Toleration in Maryland, on page 228 of the Appendix.

with anarchy and despotism, by the Protestant Reformation in the sixteenth century, and by the French Revolution in the eighteenth century, was preserved in great measure through the influence of the Church, which upheld, within due limits, the principle of authority, as well as the rights of individuals."

We do not find here any mention of the Protestant Reformation as among the causes through which the world has been advanced, but there are also omitted such important influences as the Renaissance, the invention of printing, the marvellous development of science, the great mechanical inventions, the progress of popular education, and the establishment of methods of free inquiry in all departments of knowledge. The world has been helped by such influences as these, not through the aid of the Catholic Church, but in spite of its opposition to them.*

Catholics are not modest, however, in putting forth their claims for their Church, and Gilmour, in his "Bible History," another favorite text-book in the parochial schools, makes still more sweeping statements, for he says (on page 298 of that book):

"Nearly all the present governments of Europe were formed during the Middle Ages, with their languages and laws. When we add to this the abolition of slavery in Europe, the civilization of the barbarians, the softening of manners, the elevation of women, the Magna Charta, trial by jury, the habeas corpus, the common law, and the sanctity of the home, all the direct results of the teachings of the Catholic Church in the Middle Ages, it will be seen that not only the Church has been no obstacle to progress, either in science or art, but that to Catholics is due the discovery of nearly all the valuable inventions we have. Carefully examined it will be seen that with the exception of the steam engine and the railroad, little that is really new has been discovered other than by Catholics."

---

* See note, on what Catholics have done for Science, in Appendix, page 232.

These quotations have been multiplied in order to show how thoroughly and constantly the Catholic text-books misrepresent history in the interests of the Church. What is complained of in Swinton's foot-note becomes the persistent method of these books. GEORGE W. COOKE.

CATHOLIC MISREPRESENTATIONS OF PROTESTANTISM.

LETTER OF THE REV GEORGE W. COOKE.

[From the Dedham *Standard*, Feb. 16, 1889.]

X.

The main argument presented against Swinton's History by Catholics is, that it misrepresents Catholicism and the history of the Catholic Church. They demand historic accuracy and the suppression of the sectarian spirit on the part of Protestants.

Why should not the Catholics practise what they preach? They preach accuracy and tolerance, but they do not carry them into their own methods. They would seem to believe that accuracy and tolerance are very much needed on the part of Protestants in dealing with Catholics, but not on the part of Catholics in dealing with Protestants.

In the school-books, the catechisms, and the histories produced by Catholics, Protestantism is frequently and grossly misrepresented. A pertinent illustration of this may be found in Bishop Gilmour's "Bible History," which is "a compendium of church history for the use of Catholic schools in the United States." From page 304 of this book I quote two paragraphs, word for word:

"To make converts, Catholicity has ever appealed to reason; Protestantism, like Mohammedanism, to force and violence. In England and Scotland, Protestantism was forced upon the people by fines, imprisonment, and death; in Germany and Prussia, Sweden, and Denmark, and Nor-

way, the same. In America the Puritans acted in like manner.

"Protestantism began with 'an open Bible and free interpretation,' and has ended in division and disbelief. By the above principle every one becomes judge of what he will or will not believe. Hence among Protestants there are almost as many religions as there are individuals, the churches divided and torn into pieces, ending in infidelity and Mormonism. On the other hand, Catholicity remains ever the same, because Catholicity is truth, and truth changes not."

On page 309 some of these charges are repeated in a more emphatic manner:

"In the Protestant world faith is rapidly passing away, to be replaced by indifference or positive hostility to religion. The sects have lost their power, are divided and torn among themselves, their only bond of unity being a common hostility to Catholicity. The Protestant world seems to have lost confidence in revelation to save the world, and is falling back upon education, hoping that men will be saved by a knowledge of science without religion, forgetting, seemingly, that man is a spiritual being and needs religion to purify and guide, and keep his unruly passions subject to reason."

It is astonishing that a Church which for centuries made use of the Inquisition, should charge Protestantism with making converts by the means of force.* That a Church

* The implied accusation that the Church authorized the Inquisition to make use of force in making converts is untrue; it is simply an anti-Catholic campaign lie. Very extraordinary misconceptions obtain as to the relation which the Church held to the Spanish Inquisition.

Leopold von Ranke, whom Mr. Cooke himself (page 76) calls "the greatest of Church historians," and characterizes as "never sectarian," "always moderate and perfectly fair," says in his "History of the Popes" (Vol. II., page 422): "The Roman Court would not hear of conversions effected by armed apostles. It was not of such methods that Christ availed himself; men must be led to the temple but not dragged into it." The same author, in his work, "The Ottoman and Spanish Empires in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," says: "The Inquisition was a royal court of judicature . . . the inquisitors were royal officers. The kings had the right of appointing and dismissing them. . . . It was in spirit and

guilty of the massacre of St. Bartholomew should charge another with violence, is of all things strange and unseemly.* And why should not Catholics look at home for infidelity and unbelief? The thinking men of France, its legislators, its political economists, its editors, its scientists, its writers and poets, are almost without exception men who openly reject what the Church teaches. It is so in Italy; it is so in every progressive Catholic country without exception. The intelligence of the European world to-day is not on the side of

---

tendency, above all, a political institution. The Pope had an interest in the thwarting of it; and he did so, and as often as he could. But the king had an interest in constantly upholding it."

Cardinal Manning, who certainly knows what the teaching and spirit of the Catholic Church is, declares that "faith is an act of the will, and that to force men to profess what they do not believe is contrary to the law of God, and that to generate faith by force is morally impossible."

According to these authorities (and Guizot supports Ranke), it is evident that the Church did not make converts by force and was not at all responsible for the evil doings of the Inquisition. — R. J. J.

* This is another of Mr. Cooke's libels of the Catholic Church. There is no truth in the scandalous imputation here made. The St. Bartholomew massacre has been execrated by Catholics equally with Protestants.

Guizot says that when Pope Gregory XIII. learned the full truth about the massacre, he expressed his horror of the deed, even to tears. (Guizot's *History of France*, Vol. IV., page 384.)

Even the partisan Baird, of whose work the Church *Quarterly Review* (Protestant) says that, "On every page his innate and irrepressible sympathy . . . with the Reformers, rather than with the Roman Catholics, is open and undisguised," declares (Vol. II., page 564) that "Contrary to the firm persuasion of the Protestants, who wrote contemporary accounts of the massacre, we must, in all probability, . . . acquit Gregory XIII. of any knowledge of the disaster impending over the Admiral and the Huguenots."

J. Gilmary Shea, in his article on this subject, says that even the London *Athenæum* has made "the admission that the common view of St. Bartholomew massacre is one of the great historical errors which has been transmitted from teachers to taught during a long course of years."

Summing up the whole testimony on this subject of the St. Bartholomew massacre, a Catholic writer says: "The accusation that the Catholic Church was in any way guilty of the massacre has not only no grounds, but no shadow of a ground to rest upon, and is the pure invention of a stupid and malignant bigotry, regardless alike of rational probability and of historical truth."

the Catholic Church. This may be seen very clearly in the attitude of the legislators of such countries as France, Austria, and Italy, countries which deal with education and all kindred subjects from a purely secular point of view. It is in countries such as these, where there is a nominal acceptance of Catholicism, that infidelity is working the greatest evils.*

A book in use in the parochial schools is the "Modern History," by the Rev. P. F. Gazeau. It gives an account of the Reformation, and one that misrepresents every part taken in it by the reformers. Can one read these words, from pages 62 to 65, without feeling that the spirit of tolerance and historic justice is not here?

---

* This is another exhibition of Mr. Cooke's brilliant gift of dogmatic assertion. The reader already knows with what ease and grace he makes the most serious and, if true, alarming statements, without offering any proof in their support. "The thinking men of France are almost without exception men who openly reject what the Church teaches." Who says so? Mr. Cooke, of Dedham, says so. Does he cite any authority or give us any statistics to confirm this very grave assertion? Naturally, this is quite unnecessary. Does not Mr. Cooke, of Dedham, carry the critical and religious census of France about with him? Does he not know, by intuition, the religious views of all the French legislators, editors, scientists, and poets? And are not the rest of the "thinking men" of that country all catalogued in his roomy and clairvoyant mind? Therefore, he can tell us, with a confidence which makes corroborative authority quite superfluous, that they are all anti-Catholics. "The intelligence of the European world to-day is not on the side of the Catholic Church," is Mr. Cooke's decision, and it would be unseemly to press for any evidence to sustain so conclusive a judgment. What is the use of a mind so authoritative, a judgment so conclusive as Mr. Cooke's, if, whenever he pronounces upon questions like these, he is to be asked to give references and authorities? It is true that writers of high repute, many of them resident in Europe (which some would say was a better place of observation for this purpose than Dedham), as well as ample statistics, declare that the Catholic Church is not losing but gaining ground, not in Europe only but all over the world. But when Mr. Cooke dives down into the somewhat turbid deep of his inner consciousness and brings up a glittering pearl of truth, who shall presume to talk about dull facts and authorities? If facts and authorities are at variance with Mr. Cooke's discoveries, so much the worse for the facts! —R. J. J.

"Wicked men are always disposed to rebel against authority. The sale of indulgences and the word 'reform' were simply made the pretext by the able but unprincipled Luther for the outburst of the storm that was to devastate Europe and break up the spiritual unity of Christendom. . . . He caught the ear of his audience by appealing to a false spirit of nationality, abusing Rome and the pope, and flattering the national pride of intellect. His doctrines, of which, justification by faith alone, without good works, formed the basis, spread like wildfire and created immense commotion. At a time when laxity of morals widely prevailed, to tell men that, provided they believe in Christ, it mattered little what they did, was to justify all evil actions. . . . The pretended reformer respected the laws of morality no more than those of justice: he permitted Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, in defiance of the express prohibition of Jesus Christ, to have two wives at the same time, nor did he himself scruple to commit the double sacrilege of marrying a nun. To justify his enormities he said that he was inspired by Heaven, and openly vented his spleen on the Sovereign Pontiff and other champions of the faith. No one can peruse without a blush of shame and indignation the coarse jests, the buffoonery, and the indecencies with which his works are sullied; and it is difficult to conceive how such a leader could have found followers, were it not known what power passion, pride, money, and pleasure have over the human heart."

This is the man Martin Luther becomes when his history is taught in the parochial schools! No Protestant thinks Luther was a perfect man, but surely he was no such man as this. Genuine history has not made him thus to appear. The evidence is abundant which proves he was no pretender, no lover of evil, no self-seeker. He stands out in history as one of the most honest, sincere, and heart-whole among men, whatever may be said by Gazeau or any other writer of parochial text-books.

Here is "The Catechism of Perseverance," another favorite book among Catholics. It has this to say about Protestants:

"In order to know that Protestantism is a false religion, or rather no religion at all, it will be sufficient simply to

bear in mind: First, that it was established by four great libertines; second, that it owes its origin to the love of honors, covetousness of goods of others, and the love of sensual pleasures, three things forbidden by the gospel; third, that it permits you to believe whatever you please, and to do whatever you believe; fourth, that it has caused immense evils, deluged Germany, France, Switzerland, and England with blood; it leads to impiety, and finally to indifference, the source of all revolutions past and present. We must, therefore, be on our guard against those who preach it, and cherish a horror for the books which disseminate it."

I am inclined to think these quotations prove that Catholics write history in such a manner that their own Church is made to appear always in the right. Protestantism is misrepresented, its doctrines perverted, and its defects exaggerated. This being the case, it does not appear well for Catholics to complain of Swinton. Their worst charges against him, if all true, would not compare with the misrepresentation and sectarianism to be found in many of the Catholic text-books. History is taught in the parochial schools with a distinctly sectarian purpose, with a purpose of making the pupils Catholics and devotedly attached to the Church.

The quotations taken from the Catholic school-books have been multiplied in order to convince the reader that what has been complained of in these books is a characteristic inherent in the very method of all which have been mentioned. It is not so much complained that the statements put forth in these books are untrue, as that they distort history by neglecting its true proportions.* Have none of the Protestant bodies done anything in the United States? One would

* Mr. Cooke must excuse Catholics if they decline to accept his judgment as to what is or is not a good historical text-book. A man who, after carefully reading it, found Swinton's book accurate and impartial, and offered to substantiate every word of it "by a consensus of unbiased historians," — which, in view of the many gross errors which Protestant authorities acknowledge it to contain, is an obvious absurdity, — cannot expect Catholics to defer to him as a critic of any historical text-book, whether used in parochial or public schools. — R. J. J.

not get the least idea that they had done any good work whatever by the reading of these books. Everything good in them, every word of praise, is reserved for Catholics. For one, I am not in the least inclined to minimize the noble work of the Jesuits in the exploration and development of America; but I cannot forget that others did as much or more. What I believe in is, the recognition of all historic truth, so far as we can find it out; and the teaching of it to our children. Let us have the truth of history, whoever it may show to have been in fault in the past.* Now the teaching of history to support our own party can be only an evil, for it perverts the mind and it takes away from history the lessons it ought to teach us.

Not only did the Catholics accomplish much in the colonial days of the United States, but the Puritans, the Friends, the Baptists, the Moravians, and other religious bodies also accomplished much. Some of these denominations, notably the Friends and the Moravians, did much for the Indians; but they did it in a more peaceable and a more Christian spirit than was shown by the Catholics. The Catholic textbooks utterly ignore these other denominations, and say not one word of their good deeds. This may be an unprejudiced and truthful way of writing and teaching history; but I am not able so to understand it. To me it seems a most pernicious way, and a way calculated to pervert the minds of children, and to make men and women suppose that to be truth which is not truth.

Then again, why should there be Catholic histories, geographies, readers, grammars, and arithmetics? Suppos-

* Yes, by all means let us have the truth of history, but Mr. Cooke will never succeed in palming off his crude and uninformed conceptions of "the truth of history" as the genuine thing itself. "The truth of history" is accessible, but Mr. Cooke has not gone to the right sources for it; it is not to be found in the "No-Popery" leaflets. — R. J. J.

ing every religious body prepared its own text-books, and that Methodists, Baptists, Episcopalians, Congregationalists, and Universalists, with each of the other denominations, as well as Mormons, Spiritualists, and Ingersollites, all prepared school-books to agree with their own special teachings. We can easily conceive what this would lead to; that it would destroy the school system of the country; that it would vastly increase the ignorance with which we have to contend, and that it would, worst of all, foster the spirit of sectarianism until it became everywhere the ruling power in our land. This is a result Protestants do not desire. Do Catholics desire it? It would seem so by the books from which they teach their children,—books that are calculated to make devoted Catholics, but not to make intelligent men and women or faithful citizens of a free country.

GEORGE W. COOKE.

MR. COOKE'S LETTERS REVIEWED.

NON-FULFILMENT OF HIS PROMISE TO SUBSTANTIATE EVERY WORD IN SWINTON'S TEXT-BOOK. — REV. R. J. JOHNSON RECALLS THE DISCUSSION TO THE TRUE ISSUE.

[From the Dedham *Standard*, Feb. 23, 1889.]

In any serious discussion the time comes when it is necessary to hold one's opponent to the essential question at issue, and to recall him from the side questions which have no bearing upon it, but which are so easily brought into a debate to the confusion of argument.

I have been an attentive reader of the letters that the Rev. George W. Cooke has written in the attempted fulfilment of his purpose to show "that Swinton has not been unjust to the Catholic Church, and that he does not misrepresent its teachings of the Reformation era," and I have been impressed, first of all, with the dexterity shown by this adroit

disputant in shifting the ground of controversy, so as to almost completely change the issue between us. Let me recall to your readers exactly what he promised in his letter of Dec. 22 to show. These are his words: "I believe the fact is that Swinton understates rather than overstates the case against the Catholic Church at the time of the Reformation."

Observe, please, that it is Swinton's case "against the Catholic Church" that, Dec. 22, your correspondent calls "understated." Then came his promise:

"Since the question has been raised by Mr. Johnson, I propose to say something at another time on the subject of indulgences, with the purpose of showing that Swinton *has not been unjust to the Catholic Church, and that he does not misrepresent its teachings of the Reformation era.* What the *Catholic Church* teaches now is not the question in controversy, but what it taught at the time of Luther. A *consensus* of unbiased historians will prove that Luther had just cause for the protest he made *against the corruptions of the Church.* Such a *consensus* will substantiate every word contained in Swinton's History."

The emphasis above used is mine. I desire to direct special attention to the emphatic words; and first, let us observe just what it was that your correspondent, on Dec. 22, plainly had "the purpose of showing." He was to show, as you see, that Swinton had not been "*unjust to the Catholic Church*," and that he "does not misrepresent *its* teachings." He was to show that Swinton correctly states "what *it* taught" — that is, the Church — "at the time of Luther."

That was the intention, and it could not have been stated in clearer terms. It was the Catholic Church and its teachings that were to be shown to be justly and fairly represented in Swinton's book. But in the very first letter of the series in which this was to be done, I find instead that your correspondent practically abandons the effort to do so, and seeks to give an entirely new direction to the controversy, In this first letter of the series (published Jan. 19), this

dexterous disputant, who, a month earlier, was going to justify Swinton's statements about indulgences as fairly representing the Catholic Church's teaching, discovers instead that Swinton did not mean his statements to be taken as representing the teaching of the Church itself at all, but only as representing the teaching of "some of its over-zealous members." Hear him on Jan. 19:

"This is Swinton's account of the origin of Protestantism, and the foot-note is the chief cause of complaint by the Catholics. A careful and fair-minded reading of the whole passage, as cited, together with the foot-note, ought to make it evident that Swinton does not say that the Church taught, as one of its doctrines, that 'the purchaser of indulgence was delivered from all his sins.' His language bears the fair interpretation that he charged this teaching, not upon the Church, but upon some of its over-zealous members. When all that he says about the Catholic Church is taken into consideration, and the liberality with which he speaks of it everywhere else, this interpretation is the only one which can justly be given to his words. With this interpretation, which ought to be accepted, when there is no good reason for any other, the charge against Swinton falls to the ground."

The essential difference between what your correspondent promised to show us in December, 1888, and what he tried to show us in January, 1889, is at once apparent. At the former date he declared that Mr. Swinton had understated "the case against the Catholic Church," and that his note on indulgences "did not misrepresent its teachings of the Reformation era." At the latter date your correspondent finds that Mr. Swinton, in the same note, did not refer at all to the teaching of the Church, but only to "some of its over-zealous members." There are twenty-eight days between Dec. 22 and Jan. 19. It is a fair inference, and one that is creditable to your correspondent's thirst for knowledge, that during that interval he had begun to read the history of the Lutheran era, and had convinced himself

that Swinton's statements could not be defended if they were taken as definitive of the Catholic Church's teaching. Hence, with admirable agility, he lets himself down to the milder position that Swinton's statements are all right, if they are interpreted not to apply to the Church (as he said on Dec. 22 last), but merely to "some of its over-zealous members." *Facilis descensus.* The abandonment of the original contention might have been made with more frankness, but not with more facility. Mr. Cooke is hardly ingenuous, but he is certainly ingenious.

Less ingenuous and not nearly so ingenious, as it seems to me, is the next effort of your correspondent. Immediately after insisting that Swinton's foot-note about indulgences does not refer to the Church's teaching, nor correctly represent it, he seeks to show that Swinton does give "a true interpretation of the teaching and practice of the Catholic Church in the matter of indulgences." Now if a thing is black it cannot be white, and if white, it is not black. Swinton nowhere gives an interpretation of the teaching and practice of the Catholic Church in the matter of indulgences, except in the foot-note complained of by Catholics as misrepresenting the teaching of their Church. Now your correspondent insists that this note does not charge this teaching upon the Church, but only "upon some of its members." How, if that be the case, can he, with any regard to reason or logic, cite authorities to show that Swinton "gives a true interpretation of the teaching and practice of the Catholic Church, in the matter of indulgences"? Nowhere in the "Outlines," except in this note, is any definition given of indulgences; and this foot-note, we are now assured, does not refer to the Church's teaching, but merely to that of "some of its over-zealous members." And yet, right on the heels of this declaration, we are invited to listen to authorities who endorse Swinton as giving "a true interpretation" of the teaching and

practice, not of "some of its over-zealous members," but of "the Catholic Church." This is the same thing as it would be for a man charged with homicide to set up two conflicting pleas at the same time: first, an alibi, that he was nowhere near the scene of the crime; and secondly, that he killed the man in self-defence. If Swinton does not state the Catholic Church's teaching at all in his foot-note, that is one thing. If he gives "a true interpretation" of it, that is quite another thing. But your correspondent claims almost in the same breath that Swinton does and does not; first, that the foot-note does not refer to the Church's teaching at all, and then that it "gives a true interpretation" of that teaching.

I am sure that my readers will sympathize with me in the peculiar difficulties of dealing with a controversialist who faces two opposite ways at once. I will try, however, to accommodate myself to the contrariety of his arguments. And first, setting aside for the time being his asseveration that the foot-note does not refer to the Church's teaching, let us look at the authorities by which your correspondent would show that the note is entirely right, and does represent with fairness and justice the teaching of the Church.

Mr. Edwin D. Mead is first cited as saying "that this note states the substantial truth of history." * Rev. Dr. A. A. Miner is next cited as saying that "its definition of indulgences is undeniably correct." † Then follows a quotation from a petition signed by several ministers and laymen of the Evangelical Alliance (a body upon whose strict impartiality and freedom from sectarian bias your correspondent, strangely enough, omits to insist!), in which it is said that "the paragraph which led to the book's ejection contained a true statement of history." This is another square endorsement of the foot-note complained of by Catholics for its injustice to their

---

* See foot-note on page 55.

† See foot-note on page 66.

faith. The petition of the Evangelical Alliance, thus referred to, prayed for a restoration of the text-book in the Boston schools, and gave these three reasons for this restoration:

1. The book has had a long and honorable tenure of our public schools (ten years' use).
2. The paragraphs and foot-note, on account of which the book has been rejected, contain a true statement of history.
3. The book ejected is upon the expurgatory lists of books of a certain religious sect.

The Boston *Post*, a paper that is well known to be under able Protestant editorial direction, and that cannot be suspected of showing any undue regard for Catholic interests, comments, in its issue of Sept. 29, 1888, upon these three reasons of the Evangelical Alliance, as follows:

"The first and third reasons put forward by the Evangelical Alliance do not require much consideration. The first amounts to saying that no abuse of long standing should be corrected; and the third, the argument that a particular book should be used in a non-sectarian school, because it is particularly objectionable to a certain number of our citizens, is so unreasonable as to be almost humorous. The second objection is not one whit more fair. It is undeniable, indeed, that the foot-note stating that an indulgence has been 'represented as a permission to commit sin,' contains a true statement of history, for such representations have falsely so been made. But how would the members of the Evangelical Alliance relish the following statements in the foot-note of a school text-book? — 'Luther is represented to have turned reformer because he was enraged that the selling of indulgences had not been committed to his order alone.' Such an account of the Reformation would, of course, be misleading to the last degree, and yet precisely this representation has been made, and not by Catholic authority either, but by an English writer of world-wide reputation."

The remarks of the *Post* on the petition which your correspondent cites to sustain his position leave nothing more to be said on that point, and I pass on to the next. The *Evangelist* is next cited by him as saying of Swinton's foot-note that "it seems to us a very fair statement of the facts

of the pardoner's trade as it existed at the time." But that opinion does not so much as touch the point at issue, which is, not whether the foot-note states "the facts of the pardoner's trade at the time," but whether it states the teaching of the Catholic Church at that time, or at any time. The next quotation by your correspondent is from the *Congregationalist* of Nov. 29, which said:

"The general estimate of the Inquisition which it presents, and most of its special declarations, are historically correct, and ought to be taught."

But this quotation in no way bears upon the disputed point. "The general estimate of the Inquisition" is not what we are discussing; the doctrine of the Catholic Church on indulgences is the subject of controversy. The *Congregationalist's* opinion on indulgences has been squarely given, however, and here it is:

"The question, what did the purchasers of indulgences in Luther's day actually represent them to be? is exciting considerable interest in Boston because of the transfer by the School Committee of a High School instructor from the department of history, for teaching, among other things, that in process of time they were represented as actual pardons of guilt, and the purchaser of an indulgence was said to be delivered from all his sins. The book, 'Swinton's Outlines of History,' in which this passage is found, has also been removed from the schools. It will be seen by any one who consults Dr. Fisher's able exposition of the subject, on the first page, that the sentence just quoted is one of those inaccurate and misleading generalizations which are to be found in too many of our short school histories. That there were flagrant abuses connected with the sale of indulgences, is acknowledged by all fair-minded Catholic historians; but that any accredited authority of the Roman Church was accustomed to commend these indulgences as pardons of guilt, is an assertion unsupported by the facts of history. In our controversy with Catholics, we have strong ground, and there is no occasion to weaken our position by an over-statement, not to say mis-statement, of the evils historically connected with the Roman Church."

Your correspondent, in his letter of Jan. 19, commends the *Congregationalist* as "another able religious journal," and I am encouraged to hope, therefore, that he will give some weight to its view above quoted. R. J. JOHNSON.

OTHER AUTHORITIES EXAMINED.

THE "CONSENSUS OF UNBIASED HISTORIANS."

[From the Dedham *Standard*, March 2, 1889.]

In my last I reviewed some of the arguments and authorities by which your correspondent has recently sought to prove the unprovable and establish the impossible; namely, that the Catholic Church of Luther's time, or any other time, represented that "an indulgence was a pardon of guilt," and that "the purchaser of indulgences was said to be free from all sins." In the present letter I will further discuss the arguments which he draws from his citations.

The Boston *Transcript* is his next authority; and but for one circumstance, your correspondent would be fairly enough entitled to whatever weight the opinion of that journal has. Since expressing the opinion which he quoted from its columns, the *Transcript* has published severely critical notices of the text-book in question in its issues of Feb. 4 and 8, in which many errors which it contains are pointed out. Thus the *Transcript* has practically receded from its defence of Swinton's "Outlines." As to its early position the *Transcript* took the same point of view as that of the Evangelical Alliance.

The Boston *Record* is also cited in favor of Swinton, but I do not find in its editorial columns for June 20 the opinion attributed to it by your correspondent. But the *Advertiser* of that date, which is the *Record's* morning issue, and is conducted by the same editors, has given its opinion very emphatically to the contrary. Contrasting Swinton's "Outlines"

with Prof. Fisher's "Outlines," the *Advertiser* has editorially said:

"Those people who are crying out against the School Board for its action in voting to drop from the list of text-books Swinton's 'Outlines of the World's History,' would do well to consider whether they would be willing to have a text-book used in the public schools of Boston which could be made the basis of a slanderous misrepresentation of the various religious sects to which they are attached. . . . A reader of Swinton would conclude that it was the Roman Catholic Church by which these indulgences 'in process of time' came to be 'represented as actual pardons of guilt'; while the reader of Fisher would understand that this impression was created in the popular mind solely by the way in which 'the business was managed in Germany at the time,' an understanding confirmed by everything that this most eminent church historian has written on the subject; an understanding sanctioned by every Protestant writer of recognized authority in Europe and America."

Your correspondent next refers to the Boston *Herald* of July 14 last, which paper he quotes as saying that Swinton's statement as to indulgences "is fully sustained by all acknowledged authorities." But by reference to the file of the *Herald* for that date, I find that this opinion does not appear at all in its editorial columns. It is copied from a news article, into which it was injected by an anonymous writer for whose views the *Herald* cannot be held responsible.

By what canon, either of ethics or of fair play, does your correspondent come to quote a reporter's remark as if it were the editorial utterance of a great newspaper? This, certainly, is not quite within the rules of legitimate discussion. The Boston *Herald* is, however, on record in its editorial column on this subject, as follows:

"It shows the correctness of the action of the Boston School Committee, in the matter of Mr. Swinton's History, that nearly the whole religious press, without regard to creed, sustains their position, so far as it is plain they are

against sectarianism in the schools. It seems to be the settled conviction of different people that absolute impartiality of creed be reached in these schools; and now that the smoke of this contest has cleared away, it is gratifying to find that the School Committee has the substantial endorsement of those who are not only quick to detect anything wrong, but good weather signs of the feeling among the conservative and thoughtful citizens."

The above editorial opinion of the *Herald* appears in an issue of later date (Oct. 7) than that from which your correspondent quotes a reporter's paragraph, so that we are certainly justified in assuming that this is its best considered judgment, if, indeed, the paragraph printed outside of its editorial columns of July 14 can be regarded as in any sense giving the opinion of the paper.

I now come to a statement of your correspondent which must have amazed your readers, as it did me when I first read it. He says that "in the Boston *Globe* of Oct. 6, 1888,* was printed an interview with Vicar-General Byrne, a leading Catholic official, who declared Swinton does not misrepresent the Catholic Church in what he says about indulgences." This was news to me, — news of the kind to which the newspapers put the familiar head-line, "Important, if true." Your correspondent quotes from the Vicar-General's *Globe* interview a passage in which he says that Swinton is not open to the charge of having stated in his "Outlines" that an indulgence was a license to commit sin. The quotation is misleading, because it is taken out of its connection with what goes before and follows after, in the *Globe* interview. But I will let the Vicar-General himself expose the injustice which your correspondent does him. I have received from him the following letter:

---

* It appeared in the *Globe* of Oct. 7, 1888. — R. J. J.

No. 6 Allen Street,
Boston, Jan. 19, 1889.

Rev. R. J. Johnson:

Reverend and Dear Sir, — I notice that Mr. George W. Cooke quotes me as saying that "Swinton does not misrepresent the Catholic Church in what he says about indulgence." This is not true. In the interview he quotes from he might have seen that I say that "The true and all-sufficient objection to Swinton's 'Outlines' is, that he says, or implies, that indulgences came to be regarded as pardons for sin." His foot-note is, in fact, worse than this, as he says: "Indulgences came in time to be *represented* as pardons of sin." The inevitable inference from this is that they were so represented by the authority of the Church.

The mistake I absolve Swinton from is the vulgar error that indulgences are licenses to commit sin, which he is more fortunate than some text-book compilers in escaping.

Yours truly,
William Byrne, V. G.

It seems to me that, in the face of such a palpable attempt to misquote and distort the views actually expressed by the Vicar-General, I ought to quote at some length from his interview in order to show how utterly in conflict those views are with the opinions sought to be put upon him by your correspondent. Said Vicar-General Byrne to the *Globe* interviewer:

"The true objection and the all-sufficient objection to Swinton's book is, that he says, or implies, that indulgences came to be regarded as pardons for sin that could be purchased for money, even by those who had no notion of changing their lives or abandoning their sinful courses. Such a general and sweeping statement as that is not and never was true. That there might be found a few here and there ignorant enough and stupid enough to think so, I admit. But these few do not justify any school historian in making such a statement, so well calculated to shock and scandalize the little ones of the Catholic faith. The injury that may be done to the faith in immature minds by a general statement of that kind is incalculable, and makes us

shudder to think how much mischief this text-book may have done in years gone by, and convinces us more and more that the Catholic authorities of this diocese have begun none too soon to take measures to protect Catholic children from such false and damaging teaching. Why, it is one of the most barefaced attempts that I ever saw, to use the public schools for the purpose of bringing the Catholic Church into odium and contempt, and thus play into the hands of the sects, in professedly non-sectarian schools. I do not see how the true friends of the public schools — and they are in the majority — can help approving of the action of the School Board and sustaining that body."

In conclusion he said: "One thing is certain: Swinton* never charged Tetzel with giving this false definition of an indulgence."

The reader who has followed these letters in the columns of the *Standard* will see that the last three lines of the interview were quoted by your correspondent, omitting all that goes before, and were quoted in such conjunction with the paragraph that went immediately before the above quotation as to leave the net impression on the reader's mind that Vicar-General Byrne had said that Swinton's "Outlines" did not misrepresent the Catholic Church. I forbear to characterize this method of controversy, further than to remark that it is not over-scrupulous or high-minded.

The controversy is in that stage where all attempts to obscure and confuse the real and only points at issue must fail. Swinton's note on indulgences makes a statement of Catholic teaching and practice which is, at the very least, misleading, by reason of its withholding a part of the truth and only partially stating the truth at all. It thus does violence to the consciences of Catholics, affronts their religious faith, and exposes the teachings of their Church to false and libellous representation. That it does this is conceded by

* This is a slip of the interviewer's pen, no doubt. For "Swinton" read "Luther" to get what the Vicar-General actually said. — R. J. J.

the ablest Protestant writers. Prof. Charles Kendall Adams, whom your correspondent has himself designated as "the highest historical authority we have in this country," says in an able paper (which appeared in full in your issue of Jan. 12) as follows:

"The point at issue is not a mere question as to the historic accuracy of Swinton's account of the Reformation; it is whether the account given has the color which may reasonably be regarded as inaccurate and offensive by the parents of Catholic children. While it might not be easy to point out a single positive mis-statement in Swinton's narrative, the general impression inevitably left on the pupil's mind is one of strong bias in opposition to the Catholic Church and in favor of Luther. It may tell the truth, but it does not tell the whole truth; and this is equivalent to saying that it tells a part of truth, and presents it in such a way as at least to have the effect of a partial falsehood. It preaches the Protestant doctrine; it omits to preach the Catholic doctrine."

And, referring to views held by Catholic writers concerning Luther and the Reformation, Prof. Adams says further:

"That this view of the case is believed to be the correct one by a great many honest minds, there is no doubt whatever; and to compel a person who does take this view of the case to send his children to a school, or to be taxed for a school, where the Protestant view and the Protestant view alone is taught, is as unjustifiable and absurd as it would be to force Protestants into a similar position, if at some time the Catholics should get the upper hand and the tables should be turned. And if under such circumstances, Protestants would not submit, it is simply rank injustice to demand that Catholics shall submit simply because the power at present happens to be in Protestant hands."

This puts the case in its true light. It is not a question of whether Tetzel and others in his day abused the doctrine of indulgences and brought scandal on the Church. The question is, Did the Catholic Church ever authorize, sanction,

or in any way countenance such abuses and scandals? Swinton's "Outlines," as it is admitted by all the eminent Protestant writers and scholars whom I have before quoted, allows the inference to be drawn — in fact, it plainly suggests the inference — that the Catholic Church did this.

That is utterly false. The Catholic Church never taught, or sanctioned the teaching of, the doctrine of indulgences as defined by Swinton. Your correspondent will vainly try to give his note an innocent character, and to show that it does not refer to the Church as such, but only to "some of its over-zealous members." The ablest minds of the country, as I have shown, are agreed that the note leaves it to be directly and naturally inferred that the Church itself was the abuser of indulgences as therein described. The Boston *Beacon*, June 23, 1888, brings out this point clearly. It says:

"Mr. Swinton's statement really conveys the idea that the Catholic Church treats indulgences as actual pardons of guilt, and sells them for cash. For very naturally the second sentence of Mr. Swinton, being connected with the first in a separate note, is understood to represent the position of the Church in later ages, precisely as the first represents the belief of the Church in the early ages. The sentence would be unobjectionable if Mr. Swinton inserted the words 'by ignorant or unfriendly persons' after the word 'represented.' The statement as now printed in the book is not legitimate."

A fair presentation of the whole subject, showing a just appreciation by a Protestant writer of the real root of offence to Catholics in Swinton's foot-note, is given in a letter by Ex-Senator H. Winn to the Boston *Herald*, Dec. 11, 1888. Writing of the definition of indulgences given in the foot-note, Mr. Winn says:

"This definition offends our friends, the Catholics, we understand, because it contains the basis of a false inference

injurious to their faith, and a suppression of important facts, which if the partial statement be made ought to appear.

"The words, 'these indulgences were in the early age of the Church remissions of the penances'—a statement of what the Church did make them—followed so closely by the words 'but in process of time they were represented as actual pardons of guilt, and the purchaser of indulgence was said to be delivered from all his sins,' no person being named as the maker of these representations, seemed fairly to imply that the Church made or authorized them. This they indignantly deny. They state that an indulgence was not a pardon for sin, nor a permission to commit sin, but a remission of certain temporal punishments due to sins, after contrition, and after the sin has been forgiven; and that the Church, instead of being responsible for Tetzel's course, disciplined him.

"We do not understand that their position as to these facts can be successfully controverted. They claim, therefore, that if the book were fair to their tenets, it would state them. This book is to be placed in the hands of children. A nice critic might indeed say that the words do not distinctly allege that the Church represented these indulgences to be actual pardons of guilt, though he could not say that they do not imply that. But what impression would a child bear away? Even the teacher (Mr. Travis) told the pupils that an indulgence was a 'permission to commit sin.' He gave illustrations which he states were merely to elucidate the text. This shows his idea. A text-book, then, if the Catholic position is true as to the facts, must be free from this obscurity, and must state the important connecting circumstances if it is not unfairly to prejudice the child's mind against the Catholic religion."

Ex-Senator Winn very pertinently cites the Revised Statutes of Massachusetts (Chap. 44, Sect. 32), which forbids the purchasing for use in the public schools of books calculated to favor the tenets of any particular sect of Christians. And, as he says, this prohibition, of course, includes books calculated to disparage the tenets of any particular body of Christians. Swinton's "Outlines" does gravely disparage, by a partial, colored, and misleading statement of history, the tenets of the Catholic Church.

The Boston *Post* is another paper of critical ability and standing which, without at all adopting Catholic views, clearly discerns the line of justice and fairness in this controversy. Writing on Sept. 29, 1888, on the action of the Boston School Board, the *Post* says:

"The committee found that the teacher in question had taught that an indulgence 'is a permission to commit sin,' and they found also that in a foot-note of the historical text-book used in the school it was stated that indulgences had been so 'represented.' Here was an obvious wrong; the teacher had given an erroneous definition, and the foot-note upon which he based it was misleading. The bare statement that the thing was so 'represented,' without saying where or by whom, or whether correctly or not, is of course unjustifiable."

Another Protestant authority of weight is the *Christian Union*, edited by the Rev. Dr. Lyman Abbott, a learned Congregationalist, who, with the Rev. T. J. Conant, revered by all Baptists as one of their foremost scholars, edited the "Dictionary of Religious Knowledge," a work used by tens of thousands of Protestant Sunday-school teachers. This is what the *Christian Union* of Jan. 10 says of Swinton's foot-note:

"The statement embodied in the foot-note was such as to convey the impression that indulgence is 'permission to commit sin.' This impression is untrue. The Roman Catholic Church does not teach any doctrine involving any permission to commit sin, and any statement which gives, or appears to give such an impression may reasonably be objected to, not only by Catholics in interest of their faith, but by all men in interest of accuracy."

And in the issue of Jan. 24, the *Christian Union* discusses the matter at greater length, and, after quoting the Swinton foot-note, delivers itself as follows:

"The Roman Catholics were clearly right in their objection to this statement. It is certainly misleading, if not

absolutely unhistorical. It is true that the Committee of One Hundred have issued a tract (No. 3) for the purpose of proving the correctness of this statement, but the quotations which they have given utterly fail of their purpose. They do, indeed, show by Roman Catholic testimony that the doctrine of indulgences was abused by Tetzel, and that his abuse was subsequently disavowed and condemned by the Roman Catholic Church; but not at all that indulgences were ever represented by the Church or its authority as actual pardons of guilt and the purchaser of indulgences as delivered from all his sins. We doubt whether it will be possible to find even any respectable Protestant authority for this statement, and there is certainly no Roman Catholic authority for it.

"If a school text-book had said that the doctrine of the Trinity was in the early age of the Church the doctrine of three persons in one God, but in process of time it was represented as the worship of three Gods, all orthodox Trinitarians would have been justly indignant. It is true that the doctrine of the Trinity has sometimes lapsed into a doctrine of Tritheism, and it is true that the doctrine of indulgences has sometimes been represented as the actual pardon of guilt; but the Roman Catholic Church has as consistently antagonized the latter perversion as the Orthodox Church the former one; and to put into the school-books, to be read by young children of the Roman Catholic faith, such a statement, without the necessary qualifications, was to give just offence to those whose religious faith was impliedly if not expressly misrepresented.

"We do not propose to enter into the battle of the school-books and their publishers. We share the resolute purpose to maintain, at every hazard, our public-school system intact, and to keep it free from every form of ecclesiastical control, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant. But for these very reasons we demand that we Protestants, who are in the majority, shall scrupulously exclude from text-book and from teaching, every statement which may even seem to do injustice to the religious opinion of the Roman Catholic minority, or which shall tend to inflame their religious prejudices and passions. We write these words partly in answer to several Boston correspondents who have wished us to tell them wherein the complaint of the Roman Catholics against the school-book was perfectly reasonable,

and in what respect the statement of that school-book was untrue."

This able editorial completely disposes of your correspondent's repeated contention that an attack on Swinton is an attack on the public schools. It very clearly draws the line between the two, and defends the public schools without defending Swinton.

The *Christian Union*, as well as the other able Protestant journals and authorities I have quoted, proves, beyond doubt, that Swinton's book is an inaccurate and therefore an unfit work to be used in our public schools.

Prof. Charles Kendall Adams, whom your correspondent calls "a genuine historical standard," has condensed many Catholic objections to Swinton's "Outlines" into a single sentence by his declaration, "It preaches the Protestant doctrine." That is all that needs to be said, or that it ought to be necessary to say, to convince any man, be he Protestant or Catholic, that this book of Swinton's is not fit to be used in non-sectarian public schools. Why should any text-book be retained that "preaches the Protestant doctrine," or any other sectarian doctrine? Does it not plainly show the bias of the School Committee that it persists in retaining a book which "preaches the Protestant doctrine"? Is it not evidence enough of an intent to give an anti-Catholic coloring to our public-school instruction?

In closing I may note once more that your correspondent has wandered far from the question in dispute to formulate other false charges against the Church in relation to the Inquisition, the St. Bartholomew massacre, and other matters wholly unrelated to it. His statements on these matters are as far from the truth as those which he makes concerning the doctrine of indulgences, but I am not to be dragged into that new and foreign field of controversy. When he has proved his first proposition, which was to substantiate

every word Swinton has written, by "a consensus of unbiased historians," it will be time enough to open a new discussion as to the Inquisition, the St. Bartholomew massacre, or any other irrelevant topic. Meantime, your readers will see the necessity, if we are ever to reach a conclusion, of returning and keeping to the point which we set out to decide, namely, whether the Catholic Church, as Swinton implies, ever represented that an "indulgence was a pardon of guilt, and that the purchaser of indulgence was said to be free from all his sins." R. J. JOHNSON.

LETTER OF THE REV. GEORGE W. COOKE.

THE FACTS ABOUT SWINTON'S HISTORY.

[From the Dedham *Standard*, March 9, 1889.]

XI.

The Attitude of the Catholic Church towards the Public Schools.

Very few Protestants wish to persecute or even to misrepresent the Catholic Church. They are quite willing that Catholics should worship God in their own way, and read whatever version of the Bible they prefer. They will accord to Catholics perfect freedom for those acts of worship which to Protestants are most repugnant. It is when the Catholic Church arrays itself against the public schools, and seeks to overthrow our free institutions, that many Americans, as Americans, and not as Protestants, feel that it is time to use other methods than those of indifference.

It was not a desire to defend Swinton's "Outlines of the World's History" which made so much stir in Boston when that book was cast out by the School Committee of that city. It was not Protestant bigotry which caused so many citizens of Boston to vote for a School Committee of another sort than

that which had ejected Swinton's History. There were Protestant fanatics like the Rev. Justin D. Fulton and President ——, undoubtedly; but the great majority of people were not actuated by fanatical motives. The real fear in Boston was the overthrow of the public-school system by the Catholic Church. There are very good reasons for believing that the Catholic Church desires to put down the public schools, and that it is laboring in every way possible to accomplish that result.

The attack on Swinton's book is but one of many ways taken to make the Catholic laity believe that they are not justly dealt with in the management of the public schools. It is part of a concerted attack on the schools; an attack that condemns them for teaching morality; that calls them godless, and that stabs them by asking for a division of the public money appropriated to school purposes. It is not purely a love for historic truth which is voiced in the condemnation of Swinton. That condemnation is part of an effort to throw discredit on the public schools in every possible way, to destroy their efficacy, and to prepare the way for the incoming of the parochial schools. I make these assertions because the evidence for them is overwhelming, and because they are justified by repeated acts and words on the part of the Catholic Church. What the Catholic Church desires, what it demands, has been well expressed by the *Freeman's Journal*, one of its leading organs in this country: *

* The Catholic Church has no newspaper organ, leading or otherwise. Without discussing the opinions quoted by Mr. Cooke from Catholic journals and magazines and from Catholic writers generally, it is desirable here to state distinctly that Catholic doctrines and principles can be authoritatively defined and promulgated only by the supreme authority, — the Roman Pontiff and the Councils of the Church. Private versions of them, whether given by individuals or newspapers, are not binding on the Catholic body. They are merely the theories of those individuals or newspapers, and have no weight whatever in so far as they disagree by excess or defect with the authoritative teaching of the Church. Catholics look

"Accepting things as they are, American Catholics pay taxes for the support of the system which lacks the quality most essential in education — Christian morality. We pay taxes under protest. In order to supply what the public-school system lacks, we support many schools of our own. These schools save the State an immense sum yearly, — how much it is easy to discover by reference to the statistics. We are opposed to the defects in the public-school system, not to the system itself, under present political circumstances. We mean that godless schools, without Christ, without morality founded on his teachings, are impossible."

Our public schools are *godless*, that is, they do not teach the dogmas of the Catholic Church. As they do not teach a dogmatic Christianity, they must be destroyed, and the *Freeman's Journal* tells us how:

"We want justice. We want a fair *per capita* share of the school funds. We want to be on an equal footing with our fellow-citizens, who, if they have children, receive a return for the taxes they pay. Let our Protestant friends awaken to the danger with which godless schools threaten the American people, and join with us in insisting that the school is the church of the little ones, and that it should be sacred to Christ."

This demand for a division of the school funds is not in itself so great an evil as is that doctrine on which it rests, that the Church only should teach the young. The Catholic Church says it is an outrage that the State should teach the young. It arrogates to itself the claim that it alone is fit to teach, and that it alone has the right and the authority to teach. It says it is a sacrilege, an evil, that education should be under the control of the State; that is, that it should be secular in its character, and not religious. The attitude of the Catholic Church has been expressed by the

---

to the most approved authors of canon law for the exposition and interpretation of the doctrine and principles of their Church, and doctrinal declarations from such sources alone have authority in the Church. — R. J. J.

Pope, in his Encyclical Letter, in which that subject is dealt with:

"XLV. The Catholic Church has a right to interfere in the discipline of the public schools, and in the arrangement of the studies of the public schools, and in the choice of the teachers for these schools."

"XLVII. Public schools, open to all children for the education of the young, should be under the control of the Catholic Church, and should not be subject to the civil power, nor made to conform to the opinions of the age." *

In conformity with this declaration of the Pope, we find the *Tablet*, a leading Catholic journal, using this language:

"We hold education to be a function of the Church, not of the State; and in our case we do not and will not accept the State as an educator."

When a parochial school was opened in Jamaica Plain, in July, 1888, Father Conaty, of Worcester, said:

"The State as educator of its citizens is a relic of barbarism."

The "Catholic Dictionary" of Addis and Arnold says on this subject:

"The first and highest authority in all that regards education is the Church. With her sanction it should be commenced, and under her superintendence it should be continued."

A leading Catholic magazine, the *Catholic Review*, said:

"We deny, of course, as Catholics, the rights of the civil government to educate; for education is a function of the spiritual society as much as preaching."

Holding that the Church has the absolute right to educate, what will Catholics do? This is what the *Catholic World* proposed some time since:

---

* The Pope has never used the language here attributed to him. (See page 172.) — R. J. J.

"The Catholic Church numbers one third of the American population, and if its membership shall increase for the next thirty years as it has for the thirty years past, in 1900 Rome will have a majority, and be bound to this country and keep it. There is ere long to be a State religion in this country, and that State religion is to be Roman Catholic. The Roman Catholic is to wield his vote for the purpose of securing Catholic ascendancy in this country. All legislation must be governed by the will of God, *unerringly indicated by the Pope*. Education must be controlled by Catholic authorities, and under education, the opinion of the individual and the utterances of the press are included. Many opinions are to be furnished by the secular arm under the authority of the Church, even to war and bloodshed." *

If the Catholic Church does triumph, what will be its methods? Will it continue the public schools and grant general toleration? The answer of the *Catholic Review* was rendered some years ago:

"While a State has rights, she has them only in virtue and by permission of the superior authority, and that authority can only be expressed through the Church. Protestantism of every form has not, and never can have, any right where Catholicism has triumphed; and, therefore, we lose the breath we expend in declaiming against bigotry and intolerance, and in favor of religious liberty or the right of any man to be of any religion as best pleases him." *

It does not appear that all Catholics entertain sentiments such as these. They do appear, however, to be the sentiments of the Pope, the bishops, and the priests generally. Many of the laity do not accept them, and it is largely because they do not accept them that a more vigorous effort is now being made to build up the parochial schools. Why it is desirable to build them up has been expressed by a Catholic, Thomas J. Jenkins, in a pamphlet called "Christian *v.* Godless Schools." He says:

---

* Neither the *Catholic World* nor the *Catholic Review* ever published the remarks above attributed to them. (See pages 175 and 176.)

"Past experience has made it evident that Catholic youth, by the frequentation of the public schools, are, almost without exception, exposed to a great danger, not only of corruption of morals, but also of losing faith itself."

In the public schools Catholic youth come to think for themselves; they refuse to submit to the narrow methods of the Church or they cease to be Catholics. Therefore Catholic children must be taken out of the public schools and sent to the parochial schools, where they can be taught out of books we have already learned to understand. Books and methods which close the mind to everything not favorable to the Church, make it possible to retain most of the youth in the Church. In the words of Thomas J. Jenkins the Church says: "The public schools are infidel and godless, and must therefore be avoided." The next step is to cast out those who will not submit. The same writer expresses the spirit and purpose of the Church in these words:

"The line is drawn, and pastors cry to their flocks: 'Are you Catholics? Come over to us and send your children to Catholic schools. Are you not Catholics? Then go away about your business; we want no such black, scabby sheep to infest the flock of Christ.'"

The attitude of the Catholic Church in regard to the public schools was distinctly expressed in the Pope's Encyclical Letter, read in all the Catholic churches of New York City on Sunday, Feb. 17. In that letter the Pope said: —

"There is no ecclesiastical authority left in them; and during the years when it is most fitting for tender minds to be carefully trained in Christian virtue, the precepts of religion are for the most part unheard."

But can the Catholic Church compel its members to send their children to the parochial schools? it is asked. The answer may be found in a book called "A Full Catechism of the Catholic Religion":

"Every one is obliged, under pain of eternal damnation, to become a member of the Catholic Church, to believe her doctrine, to use her means of grace, and to submit to her authority."

While the Catholic remains a Catholic, that is, while he accepts the infallible authority of the Church, he must believe that his salvation, his eternal happiness, depends on his submission to its authority. If he refuses to send his children to the parochial schools, the means of salvation are withdrawn from him. This is not a mere Protestant interpretation of what Catholics believe and teach; but more than once this threat has been held over the heads of those who offered disobedience. During the year 1888, in Chicago, there appeared in the Church Calendar, this admonition:

"A WARNING TO PARENTS.

"If you send your children to the public school they will not be prepared for their First Communion. Henceforth, there will be no special First Communion class for children that go to the public schools. If you want your children to make their First Communion, you must send them to the Catholic school, where the instruction is given. It will not do to send them for a month or two at Easter time, but they must be two years at the Catholic school before they will be admitted to the First Communion class. This is according to the decree of the diocese, and it will be carried out."

What does this mean? Does it not mean that those children sent to the public schools cannot become Catholics, and that therefore they cannot be saved? It also means, does it not? that the chief object of the parochial school is to prepare children for the communion and for membership in the Church. To confirm this conclusion, we have the dictum of Cardinal Antonelli:

"It is better that children grow up in ignorance, than that they should be educated in such a system of schools as the State of Massachusetts supports. The essential part of edu-

cation is the catechism; and while arithmetic and geography and other similar studies may be useful, they are not essential." *

The conclusion has been forced upon me, that the opinions which I have here quoted make a distinct issue between the public schools and the Catholic Church. The whole drift of the discussion of the last year, which has developed that antagonism, has also forced upon me the conclusion that Swinton's "Outlines of History" is a mere makeshift, and that the real point of attack is the public schools themselves. This conclusion is confirmed by the attitude of the Council held a year or two since in Baltimore, the utterances of priests and journals, and by the efforts made to discredit the public-school system. For one, I think it time to take up the gauntlet thus thrown down, and to defend the public schools with uncompromising energy.† In attacking the public schools the Catholic Church attacks all which they produce, liberty, free thought, a free

---

* This is an improbable and wholly unverified story, resting upon the mere say-so of an anti-Catholic writer. (See page 174.) — R. J. J.

† Such talk as this has lately been very fittingly characterized by the Boston *Herald* as "Protestant buncombe." Don Quixote tilting at his windmills was not a quainter figure than Mr. Cooke's "taking up the gauntlet" and "defending the public schools" with his "uncompromising energy." A little uncompromising common-sense would enable him to see that the Catholic Church's assault on the public schools is purely a figment of his overheated imagination. The Catholic Church attacks no schools, whether public or private; she simply declares that our public schools as at present managed are unfit for the education of Catholic children; she only seeks Catholic education for Catholic children; she makes no attack upon any of our institutions, and expects that non-Catholic parents will educate their own children according to their own convictions. If Mr. Cooke really desires to defend and strengthen the public schools, he will do well to abandon abuse, avoid clap-trap about "taking up gauntlets," cease arraying himself in feathers and war-paint against the Catholic Church, and devote his "uncompromising energy" to promoting a policy of fairness and justice, not only with regard to text-books, but in everything else that pertains to the conduct of our common schools, and seeks to make them acceptable to parents of all religious denominations.

press, and equal rights. The Pope says, in his Encyclical Letter, already quoted: *

"I anathematize all who maintain the liberty of the press and all advocates of liberty of speech, which is the liberty of perdition."

Do we wish to have this assumed authority made actual in this country? The only way to prevent it is to maintain the public schools with vigor and in a tolerant spirit.

GEORGE W. COOKE.

ERRORS CONCERNING INDULGENCES.

THE REV. R. J. JOHNSON EXPLAINS AND REFUTES SEVERAL POPULAR ERRORS CONCERNING THEM.

[From the Dedham *Standard*, March 23, 1889.]

I had hoped to have been able by this time to say "Finis" to the discussion concerning Swinton's text-book; but some of the statements of your correspondent, the Rev. Geo. W. Cooke, oblige me to address the public again through your columns, because I feel that some of the grosser misrepresentations of Catholic faith and practice which he has intro-

---

* This is simply the regulation no-Popery rant and cant. Seriously to answer these wild and incoherent railings against the Catholic Church, as the assailant of "liberty, free thought, a free press, and equal rights," is beneath the dignity of rational discussion. These charges are senseless in themselves, and they have no evidence to support them. The passage alleged to be quoted by Mr. Cooke from an Encyclical of the Pope was never written or published by any Pope. Mr. Cooke's railings against the Catholic Church, and the quotation with which he supports them, are equally untrue. His airy assertion that the complaint of Swinton's "Outlines" is a mere makeshift, and that the real point of attack is the public schools themselves, has no facts to sustain it, and reputable Protestant journals have repudiated it. The *Christian Union* well disposes of it by saying, speaking of the action of the Boston School Committee in excluding the book: "When a perfectly reasonable complaint was made against the untrue statement of the text-book on the subject of indulgences, Protestant prejudice was ready to be fired. Some no-Popery apostles were ready to fire it!"

duced in his letters — though without relevancy to the original issue between us — ought not to go unchallenged.

Your correspondent prefaced his letter of Jan. 19 last by a quite uncalled-for protestation of his loyalty and devotion to the public schools. In his opinion, "the attack upon Swinton's book is simply a disguised attack upon the public school and in the interest of the parochial school." I am not in the least tempted to enter the broad field of irrelevant controversy to which this assertion invites me. In this discussion the public schools are not the object of attack by any one. But there is a strange incongruity in the champions of Swinton's text-book undertaking to pose as the special and exclusive defenders of the public schools. If anybody can be fairly charged with pursuing a course calculated to weaken and injure the public school, these champions are the very people against whom such an accusation may with some show of reason be made. It requires no great insight to see that it does not and cannot tend to strengthen the general confidence in our common schools to insist upon placing in them text-books which give just and grave offence to the religious convictions of the parents of a full half of the children who attend them.

If, indeed, there existed in any quarter a desire to "undermine the public schools," as the phrase goes, the persistent efforts of those special "friends of the public schools" to force perverted and distorted history, written with a manifest anti-Catholic bias, into the reluctant hands of Catholic children, need not be deprecated or opposed. If he will reflect on this view of the case, your correspondent will perceive that he is in danger of being suspected by some over-zealous Protestant of being "a Jesuit in disguise." Giving him credit, however, for sincerity in protesting his devotion to the public schools, I will suggest to him that the very best way he can show it is by helping to exclude from them all

text-books that are untruthful, unfair, and offensive to a large body of parents. The contrary course will surely imperil the public schools. Prof. Charles Kendall Adams pertinently remarks that "disaster must follow such a policy, simply for the reason that if there is any one thing to which a man will not submit it is to have his children taught religious doctrines which he believes to be at once false and pernicious."

It is impossible for me to follow your correspondent in all his gyrations. He has sought in his letters, however, to sustain his position — that every word contained in Swinton's History is substantiated by a consensus of unbiased historians — by citing several historians. It must be remembered that of the Reformation, its causes and its results, there always have been, are now, and in the nature of things always must be, two views — the Catholic view and the Protestant view; and if Protestants will not accept the Catholic view of the Reformation, neither can they expect to force their view of it upon Catholics.

Prof. Charles Kendall Adams, whom your correspondent has placed at the head of Protestant historical authorities, puts this point very incisively when, after remarking that Swinton's "Outlines" "preaches the Protestant doctrine," and does not preach the Catholic doctrine, he says:

"To any one who has received his knowledge of the Reformation solely from that combination of careless scholarship and slovenly enthusiasm known as D'Aubigne's 'History of the Reformation,' this statement may seem hardly correct; but every one who has looked more carefully into the history of this period knows that there is a side of the question of altogether another color."

Your correspondent has undertaken to expound the doctrine of indulgences as taught by the Catholic Church, but every Catholic will recognize this exposition as a caricature of

the real teaching of his Church. In his efforts to explain indulgences, your correspondent cites, it is true, some very good authorities on the subject, but it is evident that in quoting them he has utterly failed to grasp their meaning. It is well to impart useful information, but it is at least prudent, if not just, to obtain it before endeavoring to communicate it. The only Catholic author he cites, who has written expressly on the subject, is Maurel, whom he has completely misunderstood, and whose writings he has quoted only in a mutilated form, as I showed in a previous letter. The rest of what he says on indulgences is taken mostly from those anti-Catholic pamphlets which are issued by the Committee of One Hundred and other "no-Popery" literature of the day. Following these misleading lights, he imputes to the Catholic Church what she herself most emphatically condemns. It is indeed inevitable that when a man writes on a matter of which he knows nothing, he should say some very absurd things. This has been exactly the misfortune of your correspondent. For example, along with many other false statements, he makes one as follows:

"It is to be remembered with regard to indulgences that they are wholly under the control of the priesthood. However benevolently used, they are a powerful lever for gaining money. The laymen must accept the priest's terms, and the priest is careful to commend the wonderful efficacy of the indulgence."

In this one short paragraph there are three distinct errors:

1. Indulgences are not under the control of the priesthood.
2. They are not a powerful lever for gaining money.
3. The laymen must not accept the priest's terms.

Your correspondent violates the decencies of discussion when he insults his fellow-citizens with such a gross misrep-

resentation of their religious belief and practices as is contained in this paragraph.

1. Catholic theology teaches that a priest has no power, unless by virtue of a special faculty, to impart to any one the benefit of an indulgence.

2. Indulgences are not a powerful lever for gaining money. A priest, or any one else, is forbidden under the severest penalties from receiving even so much as one cent for an indulgence. I will borrow the excellent phraseology of a learned writer, and say that it is not taught, never was taught, is not believed, never was believed, and never can be believed by any Catholic that indulgences can be bought or sold or be in any sense an article of traffic. No money can purchase an indulgence, for an indulgence can be obtained only by faith, repentance, confession, absolution, prayers, alms-deeds, and other good works. Every Catholic knows that to offer money for it would argue a disposition on his part that would make it impossible, while he retained that disposition, for him to gain an indulgence. No one can gain an indulgence while in sin, and it follows that indulgences are not at any price profitable things to purchase; for the mere attempt to purchase one is simony, which is of itself a grave sin, and would render the would-be purchaser unfit to receive an indulgence. He who should offer money to pay for an indulgence would receive for answer, "Thy money perish with thee." This point is clear and certain, that the mere attempt to buy or sell an indulgence would render it null and void. The priest who would attempt to sell an indulgence would be guilty of a great sin, and would expose himself to the severest penalties which the Church of which he is a minister could inflict upon him.

But in order to gain some indulgences, you say, one has to give alms. To whom? very pertinently asks the author of "Popular Errors concerning Politics and Religion." Do the

alms go to Rome or to the priests or to the benefit in any way of those by whom they are granted? No. The alms are given to the poor; they go to relieve actual distress, or to some charitable or religious object. Why must these alms be given in order to gain some indulgences? Because the Church teaches that an indulgence is granted only on the performance of some good work, whether it be prayer, or mortification, or alms.

But perhaps it may be said that it was not so in Luther's time. Yes, it was. In all times the Church has had the greatest horror of the sale of holy things. She has issued decrees, either by her Councils, or through the mouths of her Popes, which ordained that those who commit simony (so called from Simon Magus) shall be treated as heretics. This was done long before Luther was born. We may take as examples the Council of Constance, and the Council of Lyons. Numerous Pontiffs also prohibited such abuses under pain of the severest punishments. What more could the Church do to prevent such abuses from being committed?

3. The averment of your correspondent that the Catholic layman must accept the priest's terms as to indulgences, or any other Catholic doctrines, has no basis whatever in fact, and is a typical expression of a common misconception on the part of Protestants as to the relations of the Catholic laity to the Catholic priesthood. Protestants are constantly disclosing their belief that the Catholic laity are deprived of all freedom, and are mere slaves to their priests and the Pope. Nothing, says an eminent Catholic writer, is further from the truth; priests are the ministers of the law to Catholics, but not the law itself. Catholic faith and morals are not private or arbitrary things. They are catholic, public, and taught openly to all the faithful. They are all contained in the Catholic catechism, and there can be no departure from them, nothing varied in them, nothing added to them, nothing

taken from them. These doctrines may not be equally well known by all the faithful, but the Church has always equally possessed and known them, and they have always and everywhere been taught to her children, and in their substance known and believed by them all. Having been so known and believed, they have formed alike in the church teaching and in the church believing, the law of the Catholic conscience, to which the pastors are as subject as their flocks, and which teachers no more than believers can alter. Catholics therefore are not compelled to accept the priest's terms in regard to indulgences, or any other doctrine of the Catholic Church, for them there is no slavery to persons, whatever their rank or dignity — whether Pope, bishop, or priest.

Nearly all the Protestant historians quoted by your correspondent on indulgences condemn what the Catholic Church herself condemned — the abuse of indulgences. Only two of them, Robertson and Motley, seem to give any color to the charge that the Church herself authorized or sanctioned such abuses. As far as any of these Protestant historians have avoided the slanders of the Catholic Church retailed by former writers, Catholics yield them due respect, without, of course, being bound to accept either their historical judgments or their doctrinal views. But the reader will doubtless remember that your correspondent at the outset of this discussion made the pompous declaration that he would substantiate every word contained in Swinton's History by a "consensus of unbiased historians."

On what principle does he include in his list of "unbiased historians" the names of Robertson and Motley?

As to Robertson's * "unbiased" writing, he has been convicted by that candid Protestant authority, Dr. Maitland, of misrepresentations of the Catholic Church in almost all that he has written concerning her and her teaching. Your cor-

* See foot-note, page 78.

respondent quotes from Robertson the form of absolution sold by Tetzel. An eminent divine has said, "Verify your references." Had your correspondent followed this advice and consulted the original of this document, he would have found that he has not quoted it as it is, but only as it has been mutilated. In the original this document is entitled: "Form of Absolution that has been preceded by confession." He has overlooked the words "præmissa confessione," which appear in the heading of the "Forma," and which mean that the absolution must be preceded by a good confession.

The alleged form of absolution quoted by your correspondent is manifestly a mutilated and distorted version of the original document. Besides, as Dr. Brownson says:

"Absolution and indulgence are very different things. An indulgence affects only a certain temporal punishment that remains to be expiated after the absolution is given, or the external guilt is pardoned; it is rather a commutation than a remission of even that temporal punishment which, if not commuted or borne here, must be expiated hereafter in purgatory. There is in fact no *form* of indulgence; there are *conditions* of gaining an indulgence, but there is no certificate given to the effect that we have obtained it. If we have sincerely complied with the conditions prescribed by the Pope we gain it; but whether or not we have gained it, neither we nor the Church can know in this life without a special revelation."

Again, your correspondent quotes from the historian Motley. That scholarly and polished writer has many charming qualities, but impartiality and fairness towards the Catholic Church are not among them. His bias against the Catholic Church is so notorious that Archbishop Spaulding said of him:

"Motley is a partisan of the most decided character; he writes, it would seem, more to sustain a favorite thesis than to vindicate the truth of history. His readers have very little opportunity to see the other side, though every one knows that most historical questions have two aspects, which the professed historian should give, or at least refer to."

On this point your correspondent should have consulted his favorite historian, Prof. Charles Kendall Adams, whom he describes as "the highest historical authority we have in this country," and in another as standing "at the head of the new school of historians in this country." (See his letter of Dec. 22 last.) Prof. Adams writes of Motley's "Rise of the Dutch Republic" as follows:

"The judicious reader labors under the impression that there is another story to be told. The author's aversions are so strong, and his predilections are so extreme, that they seem often to have taken absolute possession of his judgment. . . . Throughout the history William of Orange is Motley's idol and client. In his behalf he has certainly made a magnificent plea; but it is a plea and not a decision."

An ample reply to the charge in your correspondent's quotation from Motley that the Catholic Church sold pardons of sins for money, is the emphatic statement made by Prof. Fisher, of Yale — a church historian of the first standing and one whose high rank among Protestant scholars is not open to dispute — and which is editorially quoted in the Boston *Advertiser* of May 12, 1888.

"To say," says Prof. Fisher, "that the Catholic Church ever taught that permission to commit sin can be bought for money is an atrocious slander."

All such railing accusations against the Catholic Church may be set down as "campaign lies" which even Luther scorned to make use of.

But it would appear from another part of his letter of Jan. 26, that your correspondent even is not so entirely confident of Swinton's accuracy and fairness as he was when he set out on his voyage of historical discovery. After quoting the Rev. A. Maurel's definition of an indulgence as that of the standard Catholic authority, he remarks that:

"As an indulgence is thus defined, it would appear that

Swinton misconceived its nature, if his statement that it was represented as an actual pardon of guilt applied to the direct teaching of the Church. As we have already seen, the Church never formulated its practice in regard to indulgences into positive doctrine; and while Swinton states what the Church actually did, his assertion is not in harmony with its teachings."

By what rule of reasoning does your correspondent presume, in the very same sentence in which he thus admits the Catholic objection to be well grounded, to say that "Swinton states what the Church actually did"? In the very next sentence he adds that "Swinton undertakes in his foot-note to describe only what was performed by many Catholics." Surely he cannot fail to perceive the difference between "what the Church actually did" or authorized as a Church, and "what was performed by many Catholics" only, without her authority and against her teachings. And this, I repeat, is the vital part of the whole discussion. Swinton's foot-note leaves it to be understood that the Church herself authoritatively sanctioned the selling of indulgences as "actual pardons of guilt," which your correspondent now concedes the Church did not do. He now insists that Swinton's foot-note only bases his representations of indulgence as "actual pardons of guilt" on "what was performed by many Catholics." But the whole trouble with the foot-note is that it does not make this distinction at all, but conveys the contrary inference against the Catholic Church.

Now, is it not clear, by your correspondent's own admission, that Swinton's statements are false? If, as he here distinctly says, Swinton's "assertion is not in harmony with its (the Catholic Church's) teaching," what possible excuse can he have for the assertion that every word of Swinton is substantiated by "a consensus of unbiased historians"? The whole point for which I contend is distinctly yielded by him in this admission that Swinton's assertion is not in harmony

with Catholic teaching. That is exactly the objection to his assertion, and that is one of the chief objections to his book — that it asserts Catholic teaching to be what it is not now, was not in Luther's time, never was at any past time, and never will be at any time to come. Every scholar, Protestant or Catholic, knows it to be the fact that the Catholic Church has never taught what Swinton represents her as teaching, and every man who is not a scholar can know it by consulting the standard encyclopedias edited by Protestants of every denomination. Even your correspondent himself now concedes in so many words that Swinton's "assertion is not in harmony with its (the Church's) teaching." Why, then, does he prolong his tirade against the Catholic Church, dragging in all manner of side questions, and raising clouds of controversial dust, all to defend a position which, by this concession, he has abandoned so completely that it is no longer defensible? He says, and truly, that Swinton's statement is not in harmony with Catholic teaching. Clearly, then, it distorts and falsifies Catholic teaching, and clearly it is unfair and unjust to Catholics to distort and falsify the teaching of their Church to their children, in schools that are professedly non-sectarian. That is all that I have contended for from the first.

Everything your correspondent has written outside of this one vital point is irrelevant; it simply does not bear upon the matter in dispute.

Towards the close of the same letter your correspondent, speaking of the abuse of indulgences, says:

"That the Church approved of what is here described, I do not wish to assert; but undeniably these things were done in the name of the Church."

This is precisely the offensive feature of the foot-note in the "Outlines," that it fastens upon the Church, by implication, the responsibility for things that "were done in the name of

the Church," and were condemned by her. But where is the institution, or where is the individual, who in common fairness can be held accountable for all the things that may be done in its or his name? The man who forges your name to a note gets it cashed in your name. The rascal who personates you at the ballot box votes in your name. The impostor who collects money from charitable persons by presenting bogus letters from highly respectable citizens commits his frauds in their names. Shall they be, therefore, set down as sanctioning the swindle? To put a case more nearly parallel in church history, witches were at one time hanged in Massachusetts in the name of religion; Quakers were at one time scourged in the same name. Suppose, then, a foot-note in a school text-book of history that should leave it to be inferred by the pupils that the hanging of witches and the whipping of Quakers were distinctly authorized and inculcated by the teaching of the Protestant Church at that time. Would that be fair or truthful? Would not Protestants demur to a foot-note of that kind?

Your correspondent closes his letter of Jan. 26 with an extremely positive declaration as to the causes of the Reformation. "The Reformation," he asserts, "is without an explanation, if the purchaser of indulgences was not said to be delivered from all sins." "It was," he adds, with equal positiveness, "the universal traffic in indulgences, the open and shameful sale of them as covering crime, which aroused the reformers everywhere, and caused the division of the Church." That history cannot be gainsaid is your correspondent's final declaration. True enough, "history cannot be gainsaid"; but your correspondent's studies have scarcely qualified him, as yet, to be a judge of what history says. Prof. Fisher, acknowledged as a Protestant authority of the first rank, says (page 2, "Reformation"):

"Notwithstanding that three centuries have since elapsed,

the real origin and significance of the Reformation remain a subject of controversy."

Dr. Schaff (page 155, "History of the Christian Church") says:

"The Reformation would have come to pass sooner or later, if no Tetzel had ever lived, and it actually did break out in different countries without any connection with the trade in indulgences, except in German Switzerland, where Bernhardin Samson acted the part of Tetzel, but after Zwingli had already begun his Reformation."

It is evident, therefore, that Dr. Schaff, as well as Prof. Fisher, reads history on this point in quite a different way from your correspondent. Who shall decide when doctors disagree? Are not Prof. Fisher and Dr. Schaff as likely to be right as to the causes of the Reformation as your correspondent? For my part, I must think so.

Still I agree that "history cannot be gainsaid"; certainly not. I wish your correspondent would not try to gainsay it, as he does when he asserts that every word contained in Swinton's History is substantiated by a "consensus of unbiased historians." R. J. Johnson.

TRAVELLERS' TALES.

HOW SCANDALOUS STORIES ABOUT THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND CLERGY ARE SENT FROM EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.

[From the Dedham *Standard*, March 30, 1889.]

In your issue of Feb. 2, your correspondent, the Rev. George W. Cooke, continues his labored effort to show that Swinton's "Outlines of History" gives a true and fair representation of the Catholic doctrine of indulgences. Not only does he insist that the teaching of the Catholic Church made

he pardon of sins a matter of sale and traffic in the time of Luther, — which I have already shown to be untrue, by the testimony of Protestant scholars of the first rank, — but he attempts to prove that even to this day the sale of indulgences is still carried on. In support of this new slander of the Catholic Church and her teaching your correspondent quotes a letter written from Bologna, Italy, to the *Christian Register*, in which the writer (a lady) asserts that she had seen "something that proved an eyesore and an offence to my Protestant soul"— on the front of the Catholic Church at Bologna —" the announcement that plenary indulgences were sold within."

In quoting this Italian letter your correspondent naively remarks that "if a correspondent of the *Christian Register* can be trusted," then these scandalous things are still going on at Bologna. Your correspondent has a short memory, or he would not make any "if" in this case; he would know positively that the *Christian Register* cannot be trusted, because he himself said so in a letter written to the *Standard* no longer ago than Dec. 22, 1888. On that date your correspondent annihilated the *Christian Register* along with the Boston *Beacon*, in the following crushing manner:

"Mr. Johnson quotes the opinion of the *Beacon* and the *Christian Register* with reference to the worth of Swinton's book; but such authorities are of no importance in regard to such a question as this. They are defending their own position, and care less for truth than to make out their own case."

Having thus completely destroyed the character of the *Christian Register*, even in its editorial columns, no longer ago than last December, it is very amusing but not at all convincing to find your correspondent quoting from the mere news columns of the same paper, in February, to sustain a grosser and a more direct and explicit charge against the Catholic Church than even Swinton makes.

The *Christian Register's* correspondent never saw what she described as having seen on the front of the church at Bologna; not that I care to charge her with having written what she knew to be untrue, but certainly she wrote, to take a charitable view, her hastily and loosely formed impressions of what she saw, and added to it a considerable amount of hearsay which she eagerly accepted as true. It is quite certain that she did not see on the front of the old church at Bologna, or of any Catholic Church in the world, "boldly placarded for all men to read . . . the announcement that plenary indulgences were sold within." What she did see, no doubt, was the announcement of the indulgence proclaimed by Pope Leo XIII. on the occasion of the Golden Jubilee of his ordination. That indulgence was proclaimed throughout the world, and was published, not only in Bologna, but in Boston, and also right here in Dedham. I have a copy of this document, and I send it with this letter to the *Standard*, hoping that space may be found to publish it, so that all your readers may read it for themselves and see just what it says. There is not one word in it about selling indulgences or any mention of money payment for them. Yet on a misunderstanding of this document the *Christian Register's* correspondent sends back from Italy to Boston a wretched hotchpotch of hearsay to the effect that indulgences are being sold and that "full and free pardon for major sins" is being "granted for half a crown" in Bologna, while "venial offences are condoned for eighteen pence English." Thereupon your correspondent eagerly seizes upon this farrago of nonsense and quotes it as if it were "confirmation strong as holy writ" of his contention that the Church not only was in Luther's day, as Swinton asserts, but is still, engaged in selling pardons for guilt.

The reader will note that the *Christian Register's* correspondent, after retailing these scandalous stories of pardons

sold for money, frankly admits that they are all hearsay, and that she has no actual knowledge of them whatever. She says: "At least this was what I was told; and I have little reason to doubt it." If this mere hearsay "gave a shock to [her] my Protestant soul," should not the possibility that, by repeating it, she might be guilty of bearing false witness against her neighbor, have shocked her Protestant soul still more severely? Observe the unconscious disclosure of preconceived opinion and ingrained prejudice which this confession makes. In effect this Protestant lady travelling abroad says: "While in Bologna I heard a great many shameful stories about the Catholic Church. I don't know that they are true, but this is what I was told, and I have little reason to doubt it." In other words, she went to Italy prepared to hear just such things; and, therefore, as soon as she heard them she believed them to be true. She proves herself to be one of those travellers who form their judgments on the idle rumors and floating gossip that reach their ears, and who look not with their eyes but with their prejudices.

This habit of mind is in no way peculiar to the correspondent of the *Christian Register;* it is quite common among Protestants who travel in Europe, and who, though respectable, intelligent, and well-informed persons on general matters and things, cannot observe Catholic ceremonies and customs without carrying away the strangest misconceptions of their meaning, and the most erroneous impressions of their character.

I have conversed with several persons who have visited Bologna and the church of San Petronio within the past few years, and they all assure me that they neither saw nor heard of any sales of indulgences or pardons such as the *Christian Register's* correspondent describes — admittedly on hearsay. Their positive denial of such occurrences is noth-

ing more or less than I had felt assured of, for in my own mind I was perfectly satisfied that clergymen, upon whom this strange and malignant charge is attempted to be fastened, would not, for they could not, be guilty of an act which their religion not only forbids, but the perpetration of which would surely expose them, not only to the just indignation and abhorrence of all Catholics, but also to the heaviest penalties which that Church of which they are ministers could inflict upon them.

Protestant visitors to Catholic countries necessarily record their observations under the disadvantage of being uninformed as to Catholic belief and practices which they attempt to state and describe. They fall, to begin with, into the error of assuming that, because they have good general intelligence and yet cannot understand Catholic faith and practice, which they have never sought to learn, therefore those who have been brought up in the Catholic faith and practice from their very infancy are as ignorant about them as they are themselves. The story is told of two English ladies who, at great expense of time and trouble, learned the language of France and then went to that country to finish their education. Landing at Havre, one of these ladies remarked to the other, with amazement, that the very fishwomen and porters were speaking French quite fluently. It had not occurred to her that she was now in France, and that these people had used and understood the French language from their cradle. It is related of a very wise Englishman that he once crossed over to France and stayed there less than a week, and that when he got home he declared that he had always disliked the French, but now that he had seen them and knew just what they were, his antipathy was confirmed. He had, he said, found them so ignorant and obstinate that they could not be persuaded to call things by their right names; it was like being at Babel; if you asked for a shovel

they brought you a horse; they called a hat a "chopper," and gave the nickname of "ding-dong" to turkeys. It is on much the same arbitrary principles that Protestants of general intelligence and liberality of thought often pass judgment on Catholic practices, of the grounds whereof they have no knowledge. It is much to be desired that our Protestant friends might more generally assume that our common Creator has given to Catholics the same share of understanding as he has given to themselves; that they would remember that the Catholic Church has gathered within its membership a fair proportion of the men of genius, learning, and piety, as well as of men of common-sense. If they would do this they would not be heard so often passing supercilious decisions against Catholic doctrines which they have never examined, and against Catholic practices which, in view of their early education, training, and environment, we know it is impossible that they should understand. A little more reading of Catholic authors would help greatly in clearing away the misconceptions which are continually being formed and expressed by otherwise intelligent Protestants on the subject of the Catholic Church and its teachings. We are all familiar with that type of traveller who, for the purpose of making Englishmen laugh and filling his own purse, runs rapidly over this great country with a note and sketch book, and returns at a month's end to turn our alleged peculiarities into ridicule, while he gives no account whatever of those substantial things which actually make up our national life and character. Imagine a history of the United States compiled exclusively from the records of our criminal courts; these courts are, no doubt, a part of American life, but they do not afford a fair basis to judge the whole life of the nation by. Conceive of a foreigner — and there have actually been such — who made up his estimate of the political condition of America from the statements of our own partisan political

writers, quoting them liberally from our daily journals as his authorities. Would the portrait of American political life thus drawn be accepted as anything more than a villanous caricature? Assuredly not. Yet it is notorious that the history of the Catholic Church is read by Protestants of your correspondent's type, from the pages of authors who have written history in exactly that spirit and by precisely such methods.

The manner in which the average tourist in Europe acquires his notions of Italy, and of Catholic teaching, is well illustrated by Bishop England's experiences on his journey to Rome. He travelled in secular dress, so that he was not readily recognized as a priest. But he was easily known to be a foreigner, and was set down by the Italians whom he met on his journey as being English. In conversation with the guides and his fellow-travellers, he was given the most extraordinary accounts of the Roman clergy and of Catholic practices. On inquiry, however, he found out that one of the most amusing occupations of the cicerones was to recount to each other the manner in which they imposed on the credulity of English travellers by telling them the most extravagant tales, and thereby earning handsome fees. They were always anxious to give as much of the most grateful food as he could take to a good gull, from whom they expected ample employment, and "John Bull," as they called all English-speaking travellers, was always quite disposed to feast upon the scandals of the Catholic Church; wherefore, as such foul offal seemed to be the most agreeable to his palate, an abundant supply was always provided. And this is the society into which most of our travellers are thrown. Thus they receive their "first impression of Europe." So that, in fact, all the falsehoods which they produce are not fictions of their own imaginations. The Bishop adds that he could relate several instances where

some of these worthies contradicted their own statements to himself, and apologized for them, when they discovered who he was.

In his eagerness to fasten the charge of selling indulgences upon the Catholic Church by anything that comes to his hand — the hearsay testimony of the lady correspondent at Bologna, or any other equally worthless tittle-tattle — your correspondent quotes an advertisement from a Chicago paper of "Plenary indulgences that may be gained in the Holy Family Church," and a news item from the Boston *Globe*, in which it was announced that a "plenary indulgence" would be granted to those who attended certain devotions "and complied with the necessary conditions." But to what purpose does he quote such newspaper items? Is it to prove that indulgences are still proclaimed and granted by the Catholic Church? No one denies it. Of course they are still proclaimed and granted to those "who comply with the necessary conditions," and so they will be to the end of time. But does this prove that they are sold? Does it prove that they are "pardons of guilt," or a license to commit sin? There is not one word in the advertisement or the news item which your correspondent quotes, as if he had thereby made a great discovery, about the sale of an indulgence, nor in any way suggesting that one could be procured for money.

Of course I do not expect your correspondent to believe the truth of Catholic doctrines, but I do ask that Catholic children shall not have text-books that traduce them thrust into their hands to study from.

I know many excellent, amiable, and virtuous Protestants. I hold the doctrines which they believe, to be founded in error in many cases. But I would sooner lose my power of speech, if I know myself, than offer to any one of them such a gross insult as is offered to Catholics in the asser-

tion that their Church makes a traffic of God's forgiveness, and issues for cash licenses to commit sin. Much less, as a member of a school board, would I force a book containing such an insulting statement into the hands of his children.

I cannot understand how any intelligent and well-read Protestant can yield to the unfounded delusion that Roman Catholics can purchase licenses to commit sin, or buy with money pardon for sins committed, as Swinton's text-book falsely asserts. If such were really the fact there could be no security in the State of Massachusetts for life, liberty, property, or peace. It is, indeed, astonishing that some Protestants who ought to be well informed should persist in asserting, against all evidence, that the Catholic Church makes indulgences a traffic in sin. In this land of freedom, where men so eagerly seek after truth, it shocks and afflicts us to find it charged in widely circulated publications that Catholic priests may give permission to commit certain crimes at fixed prices. No such infamous principle was ever taught by our Church in any country. It is a principle which would overthrow all religion, and subvert the whole social order. No person holding such a principle should be tolerated in any country; because if he thought that by a certain money payment, and of moderate amount too, he could obtain the consent of Heaven to any crime he desired to commit, or its pardon for any that he had committed, no one would be safe from his hatred, his malice, or any of his selfish lusts. May God forgive those who, for their own purposes, thus misrepresent us to our fellow-citizens and bear false witness against us, thus perpetuating error and enmity!

Your correspondent remarks that the doctrine of indulgence is very apt to be misunderstood, in fact is misunderstood by the common people. Yet is it any more liable to misinterpretation, and hence to abuse, than the Protestant

doctrine of justification by faith alone, which to uneducated minds may seem to absolve them from the obligation of avoiding sin and doing good? Every Christian sect, so far as I know, teaches that the repentant sinner will obtain pardon from God whenever he appeals to him for mercy in the spirit of true contrition. The great mass of Protestants believe that, where sinners are truly repentant, "the blood of Jesus will cleanse them from all sin," and save them from liability to punishment. The first of the thirty-nine articles of the Church of England declares that "they are to be condemned who deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent." If Protestants argue that an indulgence is commonly understood as a "pardon of guilt and a license to commit sin," may not the argument, with equal reason and force, be retorted on themselves in the form of a contention that Protestantism offers still easier terms of forgiveness? Is not the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith alone fully as liable to be misunderstood and misinterpreted as the Catholic doctrine of indulgence, which requires not only repentance, but also confession and satisfaction?

I feel that this discussion has already reached, if indeed it has not passed, all useful limits, and has doubtless become wearisome not only to the editor, but to the readers of the *Standard*. It has necessarily been dull because the charges of your correspondent have been answered so many times before, and my task has been that of re-thrashing old straw. I shall, therefore, ask your indulgence for but one or two more letters, in which I propose to note a few further misstatements in your correspondent's letters. Having done that, I shall gladly leave the whole matter to the judgment of fair-minded readers, for I am satisfied that they must clearly see that, in the words of the *Christian Union*, "Swinton's statement may reasonably be objected to not only by Catholics in the interest of their faith, but by all men in the niterests of accuracy."

R. J. Johnson.

SOME SIDE ISSUES.

PAROCHIAL SCHOOL BOOKS AND THEIR CRITICS. — A GLANCE AT MR. EDWIN D. MEAD'S PAMPHLET.

[From the Dedham *Standard*, April 6, 1889.]

In his letters published in your issues of Feb. 9 and 16 last, Rev. George W. Cooke seeks again to change the venue, as lawyers phrase it, by making an onslaught upon certain text-books in use in Catholic parochial schools. This, like much he has said in all of his letters, is a digression from the point at issue, which is, simply, whether or not Swinton's "Outlines," in its statements of Catholic doctrine and practice, does violence to the religious faith of Catholic parents and subjects them to outrage in the persons of their children. What is taught or left untaught in private schools, whether Catholic or Protestant, and whether good or bad text-books are used in such private schools, is clearly not pertinent to this simple question. Your correspondent, though he is not the profoundest of logicians, sees this no doubt as clearly as anybody. He drags in the parochial schools, and their text-books, as he has dragged in so many other foreign topics, by way of raising a cloud of dust, exciting prejudice, and so obscuring the actual question which we set out to discuss. It is the tactics that were adopted by the counsel in the old story, who said that when he was defending a client who had no case, he simply abused the plaintiff.

It has pleased your correspondent to make extensive quotations from various text-books in use in Catholic parochial schools, quotations which he says are extremely inaccurate. The casual reader, noting his copious extracts from these Catholic text-books, as well as from various learned authors who have written on the subject of indulgences, would

naturally suppose that your correspondent had delved deep into the literature of this question. The evident desire of your correspondent, aside from his primary purpose of arousing ill-feeling against the Catholic Church, is to convey an impression of the wide range of his reading and the exhaustive character of his study of the subject under discussion. His imposing superstructure of learning is based, however, upon a very slight foundation of actual research. Most of his quotations from Catholic text-books will be found marshalled in Mr. Edwin D. Mead's pamphlet entitled "The Roman Catholic Church and the School Question," a pamphlet which is for sale at the Boston bookstores at fifteen cents a copy, while the rest of his learning is derived from still cheaper anti-Catholic compositions. If any of your readers will buy a copy of Mr. Mead's brochure they will discover in its pages the sources of the rich streams of learning with which they have been lately refreshed by your correspondent. They will see how, by the trifling investment of fifteen cents, your correspondent has found it easy to display a wealth of erudition and a luxuriant scholarship of which he had not heretofore been suspected. Shining thus with brilliant though reflected light, would it not have been a graceful thing to have given the original luminary some little credit, if it were no more than a passing mention of Mr. Mead's name?

Any one who thinks it worth the while (and the fifteen cents) to get a copy of Mr. Mead's pamphlet will find, moreover, that while your correspondent has carefully culled from its pages what the author has to say in criticism and depreciation of Catholic text-books, he has, with a characteristic monocular blindness, omitted all that Mr. Mead says in their praise. For example, on page 9 of this pamphlet, which has fitted your correspondent out so nicely with the ready-made garments of research, Mr. Mead wrote as follows:

"If any of you are in doubt about the patriotism of your Roman Catholic brethren, you have only to examine the text-books — the histories, the reading books — used in the parochial schools. Whatever criticism is to be passed upon some of these books — and I have a good deal to say about some of them presently — the lack of the patriotic element in them cannot be recorded. Many of these books ring with patriotism. The reading books are as full of patriotic selections as most of the reading books used in the public schools. They ring too with the spirit of democracy. The history of Ireland, for these two long centuries, and the character of its institutions from which most of the Catholic emigrants of America have escaped, have not been such as to make any of them very enthusiastic for monarchies and aristocracies, and they are not enthusiastic and do not teach their children to be. However much 'divine right' of bishops there may be in the books, there is no 'divine right' of kings. There is much sharp condemnation of tyrannies, much warm approbation of free institutions. Towards this American republic there is especially a feeling of gratitude of a toleration such as Roman Catholics have enjoyed in no Protestant country in Europe. There are also pretty constant reminders of the intolerance and the disabilities under which Catholics have suffered in the Protestant world for the last two centuries. And is it to be wondered at? When we reflect upon it, it is a sorry history."

Again Mr. Mead says, speaking of two histories in use in parochial schools:

"Here is a history — a history of the world, by John MacCarthy, a book of the same scope as Swinton's — to which I wish to pay almost unqualified praise. . . . An exceedingly good book too is Hassard's 'History of the United States.'"

In quoting from this pamphlet your correspondent appears to have indeed purposely ignored certain passages which it contains. What are those passages? They are those in which Mr. Mead speaks of the partisan feeling excited by the discussion of Swinton's text-book, deplores what he justly describes as "a mass of violent Protestant extravagance,

misrepresentation, exaggeration, and abuse" on the subject, and proceeds as follows:

"This sort of thing we want to see eliminated from the present controversy. In an account of the work of Bishop England, of South Carolina, in one of these Catholic reading books, the writer remarks: 'He soon discovered that the Americans, though bitterly prejudiced against Catholics, were yet disposed to be just and even generous. Their hatred of the Church arose from utterly false notions concerning her histories and doctrines; and unfortunately the Catholics possessed no means of correcting these erroneous views. The press was in the hands of Protestants, who made use of it to disseminate the most injurious and absurd statements concerning the Church. The great majority of the people had never seen a priest, had never heard a Catholic sermon, had never entered a Catholic church, and had nothing to rely upon but the false traditions which they or their ancestors had brought from England.' I believe that this is still an accurate description of multitudes of American people. I hope that it is not a description of any Boston woman now preparing to vote on the school question. If any such is within sound of my voice, I advise her to indulge in no general talk about the Roman Catholic Church until she has read at least one good book which authoritatively represents it, until she has read, if she can get nothing better, some of these histories and readers used in the Catholic schools. There is much to criticise in these books, but I think that nine Protestants out of ten will be chiefly surprised at the worth that is in them."

This, and much more in the same vein, Mr. Mead says in his pamphlet, besides the critical and derogatory things concerning Catholic school-books which your correspondent quotes with such gusto. But it was not for such passages as these that your correspondent was looking. He was searching in true partisan fashion only for the things that told on his side.

What relevancy, however, have the merits or demerits of text-books used in Catholic parochial schools to the question we are supposed to be discussing, namely, the accuracy,

fairness, and justice of Swinton's statements concerning the Catholic Church and her doctrines? If it is true that inferior and inaccurate text-books are used in parochial schools, I am sorry for it, and I hope they will be removed; but, even if such be the case, does that in any way justify the use of inferior, inaccurate, and unfair text-books in the public schools of Dedham? Assume, for the moment, that parochial school books are not what they should be. Is that any reason why our public school books should be faulty too? The argument sought to be made apparently is that Catholic parochial schools teach history with a strongly Catholic coloring, and therefore that the public schools are warranted and justified in teaching history with a strongly Protestant coloring.

Surely it is not necessary to point out the fatal weakness in this argument. Protestants are not taxed to support the parochial schools. Catholics *are* taxed to support the public schools. Protestant children do not go to the parochial schools, and therefore cannot have their religious faith offended by the historical text-books used there, however strong their Catholic coloring may be. Catholic children *do* attend the public schools, and their religious faith is affronted and assailed when text-books are forced upon them that have a strong Protestant coloring. Suppose that Protestant parents were taxed and made to pay for the purchase of the Catholic text-books in use in the parochial schools, and were besides obliged to send their children to those schools to study from those books. Would they not say, and very properly, that it was an outrageous affront to put upon them and their religious convictions? Yet that is exactly what Catholic parents are forced to submit to every day in the public schools. They must support them, they must send their children to them, and they must submit to have text-books full of anti-Catholic coloring put into their children's hands.

And insult is added to injury in this case by the solemn assertion that the Protestant views and the Protestant interpretations of history which these text-books present are the real facts of history. From the Catholic stand-point this is an assumption utterly at variance with the truth.

In this same letter of Feb. 9 last, it is evident that your correspondent desires to decoy me into a controversy over Anderson's "Manuals of History." His enthusiasm is charming, but I must decline to follow him into a discussion of those or any other text-books, except the particular one in hand. I am not in the least concerned as to the merits of Anderson's "Manuals," nor have I any book to advocate as a substitute for Swinton's. It is quite immaterial to me what text-book is used, so long as it is one that is fair and truthful and does no violence to the religious faith of the pupils.

The Anderson text-books, however, having been represented by your correspondent as written in the interest of Catholics, their author may be properly allowed to speak for himself. In the following letters, addressed by Mr. Anderson to prominent members of the Boston Committee of One Hundred, that gentleman's reply to his critics is given:

[Copy.]

Brooklyn, Dec. 14, 1888.

Rev. Dr. James M. Gray:

Dear Sir, — I am in receipt of yours of the 11th inst. in reply to mine of the 6th, in which I took exception to your course and statements in regard to my two "Manuals of General History," charging that these statements were "misleading," and that they did me "great injustice," which charge I am obliged, though with regret, to reiterate; and besides that, to say, that the assertion that my book was "Romanized," meaning that it was altered to accommodate the text to the peculiar views of the Roman Catholic Church and its adherents, is utterly untrue. My book was written for the common schools of the United States, and was designed to be fair toward the peculiar views of all — favoring none and

offensive to none. This, it seems to me, who was for many years connected with the public schools of the city of New York, is the only proper course to pursue.

You are well aware that history may be written, indeed is usually, from a Protestant or Catholic stand-point; but a manual to be used by both Catholic and Protestant pupils should be strictly impartial; and all moot points that cannot be so stated in a brief manner, as to give a fair consideration to both sides of the argument, should necessarily be omitted. Certainly one side should not be stated as if there were no other view taken. I am a Protestant myself, but this course, it seems to me, is the only correct one to take in the preparation of text-books for our common schools, which, if they are to be preserved at all, must be absolutely non-sectarian.

Yours truly,

JOHN J. ANDERSON.

[COPY.]

BROOKLYN, Dec. 8, 1888.

REV. J. B. DUNN:

Dear Sir, — Your letter of the 6th postmarked the 7th, was received this evening. It was evidently prepared for publication as you intimate. It is not a reply to either of my communications to you.

On the 15th of last month you publicly asserted that the "Baltimore Council three years ago put both Anderson and Swinton on the *index expurgatorius*, *but since that time the former has been Romanized*, *etc.*" That assertion is not true. To a fair criticism of my book I can have no objection, but I do not propose to submit to misrepresentation.

Yours, etc.,

JOHN J. ANDERSON.

It is not necessary that I should add anything to these explicit statements of Prof. Anderson. In this correspondence I have been insensibly led on until I have far exceeded the limits within which I intended to confine myself.

I will trouble your readers with one more letter only, which will, I think, suffice to make perfectly clear the grievance of Catholic parents in this matter. Vicar-General

Byrne, of whom your correspondent speaks as a high Catholic authority, and whom he has quoted as saying that Swinton did not misrepresent the Catholic Church on the subject of indulgences, very distinctly and forcibly states the offensive character of Swinton's foot-note in these words: —

"The injury that may be done to the faith in immature minds by a general statement of that kind is incalculable, and makes us shudder to think how much mischief this text-book may have done in years gone by. . . . Why, it is one of the most barefaced attempts that I ever saw, to use the public schools for the purpose of bringing the Catholic Church into odium and contempt, and thus play into the hands of the sects, in professedly non-sectarian schools."

That the reality of this grievance is now appreciated by all fair-minded readers of these articles I have little doubt. In that belief I will, therefore, after sending you one more letter to clear up a few points in the discussion that seem to call for a final word, leave the whole matter with confidence to the fair judgment of the people of Dedham.

R. J. Johnson.

A LAST REJOINDER.

LETTER FROM THE REV. GEORGE W. COOKE.*

[From the Dedham *Standard*, April 13, 1889.]

I read in your paper that Rev. R. J. Johnson is about to bring his letters to a close. As his style, his manner of treating his subject, his sophistry, his mud-throwing, refute him at every point, it is undesirable that I should reply to his lucubrations. For the sake of those who have given my articles a patient reading I wish to say, however, that my

* The points of this letter are replied to in the introductory remarks (pages 1 to 15). — R. J. J.

article on the parochial schools and what is taught in them was not taken from Mr. Mead's pamphlet. I read Mr. Mead's pamphlet, I agree with him, and he did undoubtedly suggest several points of which I made use in my article; but beyond that I was not indebted to him. I read the books from which I quoted, and what I quoted was copied, with one exception, word for word from the books themselves, and not from Mr. Mead. If any one cares to take the trouble to compare my article with Mr. Mead's pamphlet he will see that I quoted several paragraphs not used at all by him. Should any one wish to go further, I have the books in my study and they can be consulted there.

Mr. Johnson charges me with garbling Maurel's book on indulgences. I quoted with great care, word for word, nearly a column of the *Standard*, from that book, in order that I might not misrepresent the position of the Catholics. The limit of space assigned me by the editor did not permit of my quoting the whole of the sermon and interview of Vicar-General Byrne, as I should have been glad to do. In fact, every charge brought against me of misrepresentation is absolutely false.*

Once more, in my introduction I distinctly stated my purpose to go beyond Swinton's book in what I should write, taking that book simply as a text. In describing the parochial text-books I spoke of some of them as being very good, as they undoubtedly are; but the best of them has as

* If mere denial were equivalent to disproof, this would clear Mr. Cooke. But the garbled quotations from Maurel, the misrepresentation of Vicar-General Byrne's interview, and the manufactured quotations from the Pope's Encyclical, the *Catholic World*, the *Catholic Review*, and Cardinal Antonelli, remain unexplained, unjustified, and unjustifiable. The challenges to verify them made to Mr. Cooke over three months ago (April 13, 1889) also remain unanswered and unanswerable. Of what avail is his denial in the face of these facts? See Vicar-General Byrne's letter on page 123; also see pages 93-97 as to Maurel, and pages 171-178 as to these spurious quotations. —R. J. J.

its main purpose to magnify the Catholic Church. That of itself condemns them. All intelligent people to-day wish to see the world without being compelled to use the spectacles of the Catholic or any other denomination.

I detest all religious controversy. I have nothing against the Catholic Church as a church; I should prefer to praise it rather than to condemn it.* What I detest is sectarianism wherever found, and the attempt to push the interests of a sect by unfair and unjust methods. So far as the Catholic Church attends to its legitimate work as a spiritual guide of the people, I have no controversy with it. When it begins to meddle with the public schools, I can no longer remain quiet. I say, hands off from the schools.

GEORGE W. COOKE.

BEARING FALSE WITNESS.

ALLEGED QUOTATIONS FROM THE POPE'S ENCYCLICAL LETTER, AND FROM OTHER CATHOLIC AUTHORITIES SHOWN NOT TO BE GENUINE. — SOME DIRECT CHALLENGES TO TEST THEIR TRUTH. — THE REV. R. J. JOHNSON'S CLOSING LETTER.

[From the Dedham *Standard*, April 13, 1889.]

The patience of your readers must have been severely tried by this long and discursive discussion; but I may reconcile them to this further tax upon their forbearance if I say at the start that I propose to write the welcome word "Finis" at the end of this letter and trouble them no more on this exhausted subject.

It has been well said that misrepresentations do not cause any lasting injury, because they always lead people to inquire

* From this assertion of Mr. Cooke, there seems to be ground of hope that he may yet — like Balaam, who began by cursing and ended by blessing — appear as the eulogist of the Catholic Church. To this desirable end it only remains that he should become instructed in its history and in its doctrines. — R. J. J.

into the facts, and inquiry develops truth. I feel that the misrepresentations of Catholic doctrine and practices by your correspondent, the Rev. George W. Cooke, have in this way at least been fruitful of good, for they have provoked inquiry and given an opportunity for the correct statement of many things concerning the Catholic Church and its teachings which have been heretofore widely misunderstood.

Your correspondent has assumed the airs of profound literary research by parading quotations from Catholic school-books which he has taken at second hand from Mr. Mead's pamphlet. More than this, in his letter of March 9, he poses as if he were on terms of familiarity with the Encyclicals of the Pope; and when he descants upon "the attitude of the Catholic Church" as "expressed by the Pope in his Encyclical Letter," and proceeds to quote what purports to be the language of that historical document, the average reader may well exclaim, "Here indeed is a learned and scholarly controversialist! Here is a scholarly disputant who goes to the original documents in the case, and draws his information straight from the fountain-head of historical facts. He is not only acquainted with the Protestant authorities on the subject, but is familiar with all that Catholic writers have said upon it in Catholic magazines, periodicals, and elsewhere." Alas! how many are the illusions of which the reader is likely to become the victim in following the disquisitions of a writer like your correspondent! He appropriates whatever excerpts come in his way, without verifying them, and I suspect I should be within the mark if I said without being able to verify them by consulting the documents in the original language in which they were written and published. It is the common habit of hasty and hence unskilful writers to seize upon quotations ascribed to eminent authorities just as they happen to find them in the pamphlets of the period, and to use them as their own. In

this way such writers often put into the mouths of distinguished authors words which those authors have never used, and thus their own ignorance of the subject is laid bare. Such a habit obviously places any controversialist at the mercy of the slip of another's pen; and when that pen chances to be the pen of a partisan hack, writing to order and for the express purpose of putting a certain desired gloss on the facts of history, to the end that his employers may feel that they have got their money's worth, we can easily see to what depths of garbling, distortion, and even downright forgery a controversialist may come, who thus depends upon what I may call the literary slop-shops for his quotations. The partisan leaflets and pamphlets issued by the anti-Catholic repositories, the anonymous communications sent to daily papers, and the "no-Popery" tirades delivered by demagogues masquerading on public platforms and in pulpits, are the necessary resort of ill-equipped disputants who are unable to forge their own arguments out of honest materials collected from the storehouses of historical truth. Their data hold the same relations to standard authorities as that which the contents of the barrel at one's back door hold to the larder: they are simply the leavings and sweepings of literature, unsavory, malodorous, and serviceable only to the wandering dog.

From such receptacles your correspondent has produced the following alleged quotations from the Pope's Encyclical Letter:

XLV. "The Catholic Church has a right to interfere in the discipline of the public schools, and in the arrangement of the studies of the public schools, and in the choice of the teachers for these schools."

XLVII. "Public schools, open to all children for the education of the young, should be under the control of the Catholic Church, and should not be subjected to the civil power, nor made to conform to the opinions of the age."

You will observe that these paragraphs are given in quotation-marks, as if they were the actual and exact words of the Pope. Now, the fact is that the Pope has never used any such language. There is no Encyclical of the Pope containing these propositions. If your correspondent can find any Encyclical of the Pope containing them, or either of them, I invite him to publish them in the *Standard*, at regular advertising rates, and send the bill to me. He will never find such words in any Encyclical. In ascribing them to the Pope he has simply been the victim of the rummaging habit; he has delved among the literary offal of anti-Catholic repositories, and he palms off what he has thus collected as if it were well-authenticated historical fact.

It will evidently be giving him information to say that the propositions which he designates as numbers 45 and 47 are not to be found in any Encyclical at all, either in the shape in which he has misquoted them from some one else who had first mis-translated them, or in any other shape. They are evidently misquoted from the syllabus which was attached to the Encyclical Letter, "Quanta cura." Your correspondent again assumes to quote from the same letter as follows:

"I anathematize all who maintain the liberty of the press, and all advocates of liberty of speech, which is the liberty of perdition."

And again I say that this language is not to be found in any Encyclical Letter of the Pope. I challenge your correspondent to produce a true copy of any letter containing the words which he attributes to the head of the Catholic Church. If he can find an Encyclical in which these words appear, let him publish this also in full in the Dedham *Standard*, at advertising rates, and send the bill to me. It is a commonly circulated slander upon the Catholic Church that it condemns the freedom of the press. Most assuredly it does not condemn the lawful liberty either of speech or of the

press, but only that unlawful and wanton freedom which is unjust and licentious. It is obvious to every reflecting mind that the liberty to print or say anything or everything is the most hurtful of liberties. And do the laws of the United States themselves lay no restrictions upon the freedom of speech and of the press? Have we not a law of libel, a law against using threatening language, a law against perjury, a law against blasphemy, and a law against obscene literature? Was not the Anarchist paper which incited to violence and murder seized and suppressed by the Chicago police? There is a difference as to what the Church tolerates in the use of language and what the State tolerates, and there well may be a difference, because the Church deals with the domain of conscience and the State with the domain of social order. But the fundamental principle that prescribes limits to the freedom of the press and of speech is recognized by both authorities alike.

Again, your correspondent affects to quote from Cardinal Antonelli. What does he make that distinguished prelate say? That "it is better that children grow up in ignorance than that they should be educated in such schools as the State of Massachusetts supports," etc., giving these words and those that follow in quotation-marks as the actual words of Cardinal Antonelli. I deny that these words appear in any well-authenticated public deliverance or utterance of that cardinal, and I challenge your correspondent to justify his quotation of them as if they had thus appeared. If he responds to this challenge, and produces any letter, speech, address, or other public utterance of Cardinal Antonelli, in which this language occurs, I invite him to publish that also in the Dedham *Standard*, at advertising rates, and send the bill to me.

But this is not all. In his pseudo-quotations from the Pope's Encyclical Letter, your correspondent shows plainly

that if he has ever seen that document he is not able to translate it any more than to understand it. His alleged citations are so ludicrous a travesty of the text that it is hard to read them and keep from laughing. It is not the Pope's Encyclical, but Mr. Cooke's, that your readers have had quoted for them; and it is not even Mr. Cooke's original Encyclical. He has so distorted the sense of the Pope's language that I should be at a loss to discover what he thought he was translating, only that I can see plainly that this preposterous translation is not his work at all, but is taken bodily from the literary garbage boxes. Upon the whole, however, these disquisitions of your correspondent on the strength of his untruthful citations from the Pope, and from Cardinal Antonelli, will serve a useful purpose. They show his inability to give an accurate statement of facts, a limitation for which he is not to blame, for he did not make himself. But they show something that is worse than incapacity; they show that he does not argue with any regard for justice and truth.

Throughout your correspondent's letters there is an offensive imputation to Catholics of lack of patriotism and suspicion of their loyalty to American institutions. To sustain these imputations your correspondent quotes what he alleges to be utterances of the *Catholic World* and of the *Catholic Review*, in which these periodicals are made to say that the Catholic Church aims at ascendancy in this country, the control of all legislation, and the suppression of individual as well as newspaper opinion. These are the exact words which your correspondent pretends to quote from the *Catholic World:*

"The Catholic Church numbers one third of the American population, and if its membership shall increase for the next thirty years as it has for the thirty years past, in 1900 Rome will have a majority, and be bound to this country, and keep it. There is ere long to be a State religion in this country, and that State religion is to be Roman Catholic. The Roman

Catholic is to wield his vote for the purpose of securing Catholic ascendancy in this country. All legislation must be governed by the will of God, *unerringly indicated by the Pope*. Education must be controlled by Catholic authorities, and, under education, the opinion of the individual and the utterances of the press are included. Many opinions are to be furnished by the secular arm under the authority of the Church, even to war and bloodshed."

Now if your correspondent has in fact found the foregoing words in the *Catholic World*, he knows, of course, where he found them, and he can give us the number, volume, date, and page of that magazine in which they appeared. I call upon him to give us those particulars, so that the truthfulness of his quotation may be established. And unless he thus justifies his quotation, he will stand convicted of having fabricated it out of whole cloth. To manufacture writings for the purpose of condemning the writer to whom such manufactured writings are attributed, is called in law by a very ugly name. In England at the present time they call it Pigottism, after the man who, being exposed in this kind of work, took refuge from his shame in suicide.

Again, your correspondent quotes the following declarations as from the *Catholic Review:*

"While a State has rights, she has them only in virtue and by permission of the superior authority, and that authority can only be expressed through the Church. Protestantism of every form has not, and never can have, any right where Catholicism has triumphed; and, therefore, we lose the breath we expend in declaiming against bigotry and intolerance, and in favor of religious liberty, or the right of any man to be of any religion as best pleases him."

Now, I say again that if the above words were found by your correspondent in the *Catholic Review*, he knows where he found them. I demand from him the volume, page, and date of the *Catholic Review* in which those words are to be

found; and in default of his furnishing them I charge him with having framed this alleged quotation to suit his own purposes.

Can there be anything worse in argument than to invent evidence and put it into the mouths of witnesses who never gave it? Is there any possibility of honest discussion with an opponent who imputes language to Catholic writers which they have never used? The recognized canons of honorable controversy are outraged when spurious quotations are thus called into service. And if such base coin is to be circulated in lieu of the honest currency of genuine quotation, how is it possible that the general reader should be led to a just conclusion? I call upon your correspondent to publicly verify these pretended quotations. Unless he can, they must be nailed to the counter as counterfeits and forgeries.

No doubt Catholic journals and magazines, like others, have at times said unwise things; but I never heard of a lunatic being at the head of a Catholic paper or magazine, and none but a lunatic would have admitted such stuff to his pages as that which your correspondent alleges he has quoted from the *Catholic World* and the *Catholic Review*. The sentiments attributed by these alleged quotations are repugnant to all the principles and teachings of the Catholic Church, and I repudiate them as the coarsest conceivable travesty of Catholic sentiment and opinion. Why did not your correspondent verify these quotations, before rushing into print with them? When he started out, his promise was that he would prove his case by appealing to a "consensus of unbiased historians"; and here behold, he is tendering us second-hand quotations, snatched from the ready-made no-Popery literature of the day, unverified and unverifiable. From "a consensus of unbiased historians" to counterfeit quotations accepted on credit from anonymous letter writers and pamphleteers and fished out of the other

common sewers of falsehood and forgery, is a tremendous drop. Your correspondent has made it. The Catholic Church, of course, can no more be held accountable for a wild or foolish utterance by a Catholic paper than the Unitarian Church for the utterances of your correspondent in this controversy; and this latter responsibility is one, surely, that no charitable person would impute. Much less can the Catholic Church be held responsible for quotations of words falsely purporting to be from Catholic publications.

I suppose that your correspondent is, in this instance, as in the others already pointed out, a victim to his unfortunate practice of borrowing his quotations from unveracious pamphleteers. I have no doubt that he obtained these alleged quotations by cutting them, without credit and without verification, from the letter of an anonymous correspondent in the Boston *Transcript*, the writer of which had enough sense of decency not only to withhold his name but also to give the date of the *Catholic World* and of the *Catholic Review* from which the quotations are said to be taken. From the same anonymous letter your correspondent has also obtained his quotation from the *Catholic Review;* and from other columns of the same paper he has appropriated (and again without giving credit) his Chicago announcement of indulgences, and his extracts from the Chicago Church Calendar. This is the secret of your correspondent's imposing display of literary research; and it also furnishes a key to his peculiar conception of what constitutes a "consensus of unbiased historians." It has been left for him to show that "unbiased historians" and anonymous correspondents of daily papers are the same thing.

But what does the *Catholic World* really say? I find in its columns (Vol. XX., pages 623, 624, 625) an able and exhaustive article entitled "Religion and State in our Republic," which directly deals with the subject of the relation of

the Catholic Church to the institutions of this country, and which expresses views that are totally at variance with those which your correspondent imputes to it. The following are a few extracts from this article:

"Without any question . . . the Catholics of this country are agreed in the conviction that the Republican institutions of the United States are the best and only possible ones for our country. They have no desire to subvert them, and there has never been any conspiracy against them except in the malicious or deluded brains of fanatical and anti-Catholic writers and speakers and of the crowd which they have duped. Genuine Catholics will never conspire against our government and laws, but will always be true and loyal American citizens. If the majority of the people, or the whole people were to become Catholics they would not use their power to subvert our American institutions, or substitute for them those of any European nation. On the contrary, nothing could happen which would secure the perpetuity of the Republic and promote its political prosperity and glory with anything like the influence which the Catholic religion would exercise in producing such desirable results. . . . But what would be the action of Catholics if they should ever become the majority, in regard to requiring or prohibiting by law those things in which the Catholic conscience differs from the Protestant and non-Catholic standard of right and wrong? It is always necessary in such cases for all parties to exercise the greatest forbearance, moderation, and fairness towards one another, in order that these questions should have a peaceable solution. Therefore those violent and fanatical or selfish demagogues, both clerical and lay, who seek to exasperate the non-Catholic citizens of this country against their Catholic fellow-citizens, are the most dangerous enemies of the public peace. We appeal to all candid, impartial, intelligent American citizens to say who are they who seek to fan the embers of strife into a flame; are they Catholic leaders or are they the chiefs and orators of a violent, sectarian, anti-Catholic party? Our Catholic citizens, if fairly treated, will always respect the rights of their fellow-citizens. . . . They will never seek to tyrannize over their fellow-citizens, to establish their religion by force, or compel any one to do those things which are required only by the Catholic conscience."

These are the actual opinions and sentiments of the *Catholic World*. The reader will see how far they are from expressing a desire to establish an intolerant control over non-Catholic thought and speech.

After attributing to the *Catholic World* these illiberal and intolerant views which it never expressed or held, your correspondent naively asks whether "if the Catholic Church does triumph," it will continue the public schools and grant general toleration.

This is quite outside of the question which we are supposed to have been all this time discussing; but your correspondent drags it in, as he has dragged in so many other extraneous matters, for the manifest purpose of stirring slumbering prejudices and exciting the latent fires of bigotry. The question was answered early in the history of the country, by the State of Maryland, founded as a Catholic colony, where the Catholic Church was distinctly in the ascendant. The broadest toleration was granted to the non-Catholic people of Maryland, by the Catholic authorities, and no greater liberty of religious opinion and worship has ever been enjoyed on this continent.

Brownson, an eminent Catholic writer, emphatically declares in his works (Vol. X., page 238) that the very principles of the Catholic religion require us "to assert and maintain as broad a toleration as our American Constitution guarantees." And again (Vol. XVIII., pages 362 and 363):

"No Catholic writer has ever written that 'religious liberty is only to be endured till the opposite can be established with safety to the Catholic world,' or that 'the Catholics of America are bound to abide by the interpretation put upon the Constitution of the United States by the Pope of Rome.' . . . All we ask for our Church, we have said over and over again, is 'an open field and fair play.' We demand for her as a right, which the State and all individuals are bound to respect, full liberty to profess and practise her faith and dis-

cipline; and what we claim for her in face of the civil authority, or of secular society, we have uniformly expressed our readiness to concede to the sects, nay, if it were necessary, to defend for them."

One more point and I am done. Throughout your correspondent's letters, as I have said, there is a studied and systematic effort to impute to Catholics lack of patriotism and disloyalty to American institutions. There is unfortunately a class of controversialists, of whom your correspondent is typical, who cannot conceive of a patriotic citizen except as a man who necessarily holds the same religious and political views as themselves. Yet it will be obvious to less egotistical minds that a man may love his country and its institutions, and be a good citizen in the fullest sense of the term, without accepting Swinton's textbook, or accepting your correspondent's coarse conceptions of Catholic teachings and practices. Disagreement with Rev. Mr. Cooke is not the same thing as disloyalty to the Constitution and laws of the United States. The notion that the refuting of his errors and the information of his ignorance is the same thing as treason to the American flag is merely a whiff of that abnormal conceit which breathes like a strong perfume throughout his letters on this subject. Catholic citizens have, indeed, no occasion to protest their loyalty to this country; they have proved it on hundreds of battlefields, during our Civil War, and sealed their devotion to it with many thousands of their lives.

At the Catholic Total Abstinence Convention held in Boston last August, Bishop Keane, President of the Catholic University, eloquently resented the slanderous insinuation of your correspondent's letters, and expressed the sentiment of loyalty to America and her institutions which every Catholic citizen shares. He spoke as follows: —

"I declare before God and before man that the Catholic Church looks upon our country and liberty and institutions with a mingled love and admiration. [*Applause.*] Here, in the presence of the American people and in the sacred shadow of that shrine to American liberties, I say that that man who says that in the aims of the Catholic Church there is anything antagonistic to the principles of our government, — that man lies. [*Tremendous applause.*] It is a comfort to know that not every lie is an intentional violation of the truth. [*Laughter and applause.*] There are lies that come only from ignorance; and as our blessed Lord said, I say, 'Forgive them, for they know not what they say.'"

Nothing remains for me to say, except to thank the editor of the *Standard* for the generous courtesy with which he has given me the use of his space for a full statement of my side of the case, and the readers of the *Standard* for their patience, upon which, indeed, I feel that I have trespassed too long. And with these acknowledgments I leave the whole matter in dispute between Rev. Mr. Cooke and myself to the fair and dispassionate decision of all my readers, and especially of the citizens of Dedham.

R. J. Johnson.

APPENDIX

A PLEA FOR TOLERATION.

THE UNWISE CRUSADE OF THE PROTESTANTS. A DISPASSIONATE REVIEW ON THE SCHOOL CONTROVERSY BY MR. HENRY WINN.

[From the Boston *Herald*, Dec. 8, 1888.]

The public-school question demands the attention of every citizen who looks beyond the temporary expedients which partisans, political or religious, adopt to effect their ends, at the higher expediency of conducting public affairs in the interests of civil liberty. Unlike our ancestors, we have had no struggle to establish the rules of action on which our liberties depend, and we forget their value. Freedom of religious opinion, without the interference of any agent, teacher, or official, in the pay of the State — liberty of worship in short is, as classed by Lieber, one of the primordial rights of man. Forgetting this, a considerable body of the Protestant clergy and laity seem to have entered into a mad scheme to elect a majority of the School Board, which shall be distinctively Protestant, and force an issue as to what denomination shall control the board, where no doctrinal religion should be tolerated. The following seem to be the salient facts.

In May last Swinton's "Outlines of the World's History" was taught in the English High School. This work, in stating the incidents of the Reformation, recites that Pope Leo X., to raise money, adopted an extensive sale of indulgences, which, in former ages, had been a source of large profit to the

Church; that the Dominican friars, having a monopoly of the sale in Germany, employed an agent, Tetzel, one of their own number, who carried it on in a manner very offensive, especially to the Augustinian friars, which agent one of them, Martin Luther, took the lead in opposing. In a foot-note under these statements Swinton gives this definition:

"These indulgences were, in the early ages of the Church, remissions of the penances imposed upon persons whose sins had brought scandal on the community. But in process of time they were represented as actual pardons of guilt, and the purchaser of indulgence was said to be delivered from all his sins."

This definition offends the Catholics, we understand, because it contains the basis of a false inference, injurious to their faith, and a suppression of important facts, which, if the partial statement be made, ought to appear. The words, "These indulgences were in the early ages of the Church remissions of the penances" — a statement of what the Church did make them — followed so closely by the words, "But in process of time they were represented as actual pardons of guilt, and the purchaser of indulgence was said to be delivered from all his sins," no person being named as the maker of these representations, seem fairly to imply that the Church made or authorized them.

This they indignantly deny. They state that an indulgence was not a pardon for sin, nor a permission to commit sin, but a remission of certain temporal punishment due to sins, after contrition, and after the sin had been forgiven, and that the Church, instead of being responsible for Tetzel's course, disciplined him.

We do not understand that their position as to these facts can be successfully controverted. They claim, therefore, that, if the book were fair to their tenets, it would state them. This book is to be placed in the hands of children.

A nice critic might indeed say that the words do not distinctly allege that the Church represented these indulgences to be actual pardons of guilt, though he could not say they do not imply that. But what impression would the child bear away? Even the teacher told the pupils that an indulgence was a "permission to commit sin," giving illustrations which he states were merely to elucidate the text. This shows his idea. And the committee say that the examination papers of the boys reveal in their minds erroneous and even grotesque notions on the subject. A text-book, then, if the Catholic position is true as to the facts, must be free from this obscurity, and must state the important connected circumstances, if it is not unfairly to prejudice the child's mind against the Catholic religion.

The law of Massachusetts (Pub. Stats., Chap. 44, Sect. 32) plainly forbids the School Committee "to direct to be purchased or used in the public schools, school-books calculated to favor the tenets of any particular sect of Christians." This includes, of course, books calculated to disparage the tenets of any sect, for disparaging one favors another. A text-book may not even set out truths marshalled in a way "calculated" to have the prohibited effect.

How, in the light of these facts and this law, the committee could do otherwise than to strike the book from the list as they did, when the question was raised, we leave to any fair man to determine. And yet a Protestant junta proposes that every man who so voted is to be ostracized from the board, without the benefit of clergy.

Nor is this all. The teacher, as a special committee found, not only told the pupils that an indulgence was a permission to commit sin, but later added: "Should a murderer be brought before a judge he would only have to put his hand in his pocket and produce indulgence papers to be pardoned." Also, "you pay so much money in advance for

leave to commit certain sins." And when a Catholic pupil objected, this teacher among other things said, "Well, you would make a kind of penance out of an indulgence." "I may be wrong, however, I was not there and did not go to Mr. Tetzel and ask how much I would have to give to kill Mr. Jackson's cow, or to put an iron steeple (staple?) before a railway train and throw a number of people into eternity."

Is it strange that when the law is so nice as to forbid in the schools even oral comment on the Bible, the Catholics should revolt at this treatment and begin to inquire whether they had any rights that Protestants were bound to respect?

It did result in a protest from Father Metcalf. But the School Committee only changed the teacher from mediæval to ancient history, without change of rank or salary. How was this mild action received by the ultra-Protestants? Did they have one word of condemnation for the conduct of the teacher? Did they not rather organize and demand that the Swinton History be restored because it had been used ten years, and because, as they alleged, the foot-note contains a "true statement of history," without traversing the allegation that other truth was suppressed, or that the book "was calculated to favor the tenets" of the Protestants, contrary to law?

And when the School Committee could not lawfully comply, did they not declare war upon them and organize a committee to boycott them? Did they not, fresh from their own private sectarian schools, enter into nice disquisitions as to how they could by means of the State lawfully shut up the sectarian schools of the Catholics, and force Catholic children into this kind of public training, appealing to the old plea of State necessity, under which tyrants have for ages suppressed the liberties of their subjects?

Were not proposals made so intemperate that a fair writer

cannot quote them without injustice to the more discreet? Did they not, well knowing the opposition of the Catholics to woman suffrage, and apparently confident that they could use this weapon without being struck back, by reason of the Catholic conscience on the subject, hale out from 10,000 to 15,000 women from their congregations to register and beat the School Committee? The writer at least was informed that 5,000 had been assessed before a probable Catholic appeared. Usually but a few hundreds vote.

Finally, when the excitement reached a fever, some of the younger Catholics, against the advice of leaders, began to organize the women sympathetic with their cause. They thronged the City Hall. The writer inquired of many why they came. They all replied in various terms: "Because the Protestant women were banded together to drive Catholics from the School Board, and Catholic teachers from the schools."

The vices of a thousand years ago have been heaped at the doors of the Catholics of Boston. The fever may be judged from the style of the pastor of our most conservative church. He declares: "Amid the awful predictions with which the canon of revelation closes, not a single ray of scripture hope can be found to gild the destiny of papal Rome. A dense, unbroken cloud of portentous judgment lowers upon its horizon. No other light meets the eye of the observer than the glare of an awful thunderbolt, and no other sound breaks upon the ear than the glad shout of the universe, which tells of everlasting overthrow." And this is the "ice" of Park Street!

And yet the Catholics seem calm. With rare exceptions they have shown the judicial temper and moderation needed on the School Committee to a far greater extent than their adversaries.

At what do we complain? Not that women vote, which

is their indubitable right. It is at making the Catholic faith a bar to nomination where no religion ought to be considered, evidenced by a ticket without a Catholic on it, put forth on the flimsy plea that Catholics hold over; at the attempt at sectarian teaching not condemned; at the attack on the committee for doing what seems right, at least what they deemed right; at the bitter discussion; the demand to restore the book, right or wrong; the successful attempt to prevent the nomination of every man who opposed, no matter how conscientiously; at the organized effort to bring out women, who never would have thought of voting, to carry a religious test which never ought to be made.

A few comments on this wretched controversy seem demanded, and the first is that the whole matter was trivial, affording no grounds for this Protestant crusade. If a son of Rev. Dr. Moxom had been instructed in the public school that the Baptist Church had a habit of insuring immunity to train-wreckers for cash, or if a text-book carried that implication, we might expect storms in the Protestant horizon; but we should call it puerile if, on rectification of the wrong, all Catholic Boston were lashed into fury, and bands of angry priests were marshalling armies of women to storm the Protestant citadels.

Next it emphasizes the folly of holding the Catholic citizen responsible for all the doctrines of the Church. Suppose it does advance theories inconsistent with paramount loyalty to the State, even requiring superior fealty to Rome. We can only deal with the overt act of the citizen. We have no right to ostracize him till he has shown that his doctrines unfit him for his duties. And, dealing with facts, have men, as Catholics, shirked from our armies, refused our levies, demanded immunity for crime, or done anything to weaken the fabric of society? In countries distinctively Catholic does the Church rule the State? Does the Pope rule Italy

— the clerical party control France? If not, whence our fears?

Again, this mad projection of religion into the school question alienates the friends of the public schools among the Catholics. A great part of the Catholic laity have always defended our schools; they do to-day, and send their children there. But they will not continue to do so if we permit the books which we place in their children's hands, and the teachers who explain them, to cast odium on things they deem sacred; if we, when a committee rectifies the wrong, brandish our arms in the air, declare Rome to be the mother of harlots, try with an army of women to force back the objectionable book, and boycott every committee-man, Catholic or otherwise, who objects to such tactics.

Another important point is that the children in the public schools of this very class, whose religion is to debar them from seats in the school management, must far outnumber the children of those who are making this disturbance. Such have been the pernicious theories and resultant practice of the native Americans in Massachusetts in the relations of the sexes, and the individuation of woman, that with eight times more in proportion of the youthful and child-producing population absent in the West in 1850 than in 1880, the average birth-rate to natives was 22.12 to each one thousand people per annum then, while in the five years ending 1880 it was only 15.44. The lowest rate in the leading states of Europe during the twenty years ending 1879 was 26 per 1,000 in France. This means extinction; and we find that while in 1880 there were 902,354 living in Massachusetts who were born of native parents, the number had fallen in 1885 to 855,491. The Puritan race has committed hari-kari and steadily wends its march to the grave. But the birth-rate to the foreign born in Massachusetts was 49.52. Whatever may be the truth of her tenets, it is to

the eternal honor of the Catholic Church that while the Protestant clergy are powerless to stem the current of the hour, — nay, often jump into its swim, — Rome throws her arms, like the sacred circle of Richelieu, about the homes of her people, and lifts her lamp to light an undiminished throng down the pathway of future generations.

We know of no returns showing the relative number of children belonging to the different religious sects in the public schools; but we may get some idea from the fact that the children born to native parents in Boston in the five years ending 1880 who are now, so far as living, from eight to thirteen years of age, were 14,804, while the number born to foreigners here was 25,530, those of mixed parentage being 9,428, and of parentage not stated, 2,984. Giving the natives half those of mixed parentage and their share of the rest the numbers stand: Of native parentage, 20,613; of foreign, 32,133. But this is not fair to the foreign element. For of the natives (among whom are the native parents referred to) 112,525 are the immediate children of foreigners, mainly young Irish-native people. Allowing that they are only twice as prolific as the other natives, while the foreign element is more than three times, the children of this period of pure native stock may be counted as 7,669 against 45,077 of the foreign element, or about one seventh of the whole. It is true the foreign element are not all Catholic.

But the persons of Irish parentage alone in Boston exceed all of native parentage by nearly 13,000. And to admit that the people engaged in this crusade who have stricken every Catholic from their tickets, as well as every committee-man who voted against restoring the Swinton book, represent one quarter of the children of Boston entitled to use public schools, would strain the probabilities.

If, when the now inevitable hour of Catholic supremacy

in voting power shall come in Boston, the voters sympathizing with that faith shall exclude every Protestant from their ticket, and every man who has shown a disposition to be fair to the Protestants by votes in the board, they will not, indeed, be practising the precept of doing as they would be done by, any more than the Protestants are doing, but of doing as they have been done by. If these excited clergymen and their female friends had been led by the Jesuits themselves, they could hardly have served their purpose better than by engaging in this proscription at the ballot box, this building up of parochial schools by rendering the public schools obnoxious to Catholics contrary to law, this kindling of a religious fervor in Catholic ranks by the reflex fires of denunciation — this attempted advantage, which to the Catholic must appear a foul one, in the use of woman suffrage.

In the arena of woman suffrage itself the Catholic leaders must indeed be far-seeing if, when it is used as a weapon against their religion, they do not retaliate. Should they do this unitedly, the Protestants of this city would be snowed under so far as to be lost. The excess of foreign females over males was two and a half times greater in proportion in 1880 than among the natives. The Catholic women would not only be far better united, but a far greater number would come to the polls if the Church should so determine. The political power of the priests would be exalted even more than that of our clergy, and only a rare self-abnegation rejects the present prize for the permanent good of their people.

Our Puritan stock will not recognize their changed condition, but act as if their control were to be perpetual. They will not recognize their loss of numbers till they are counted among the scattering. They may, indeed, secure a temporary lease of power by using the arm of the State to deprive

of self-government these people in Boston who outvote them by denying to them, as they have, the right to tax themselves, to choose their own police, — and by the other expedients annually urged at the State House, — which would leave Boston less free than Berlin. But even that must end. For the same causes that have left them so far behind here are operative through the State as well. The same relative decline shows there. If they cling to their idols, they have only the poor privilege to be buried with them.

Prudence, then, if nothing more, should open their eyes to the truth that these two great religions should live together in amity. If, as we proudly feel, there is a splendor in the fire of John Knox defining to queens their right to rule, the Jesuit Bourdaloue in the days of arbitrary power painting a sinner with the details of his vices to the haughtiest monarch in Europe and thundering in his ear, "Thou art the man," is not to be called the son of a "harlot," even to spite his mother church.

Each seeks the same end — the salvation of men through Christ. Each is largely adapted to the wants of its people. Why, then, quarrel, like differing doctors over a dying patient, when a sinner enters heaven by either gate?

HENRY WINN.

SWINTON'S "OUTLINES" REVIEWED.

SOME OF ITS GLARING ERRORS BOTH OF OMISSION AND COMMISSION EXPOSED BY A PROTESTANT CRITIC.

[From articles by MR. ALPHA CHILD, of Watertown, N. Y., in the Boston *Transcript*, Feb. 4, 1889.]

Pupils taking up Swinton's "Outlines of the World's History" are supposed to have become acquainted with United States history, from his books intended to precede the "Outlines" in the school course. This is his explanation why the share this country has had in the world's history

has no place in the supposed all-comprehending "Outlines," except in a few places where some allusion to it is unavoidable through contact with European events. Mr. Swinton then starts out with his own idea of what history is, and, of course, what the method of instruction should be. He declares that in the higher schools it "should be to give the learner a general view of human progress"; to show him "what have been the great steps in human progress; the discoveries, . . . advances in thought, etc., that have carried forward civilization." He informs us that "it has to do with but one grand division of the human family, namely, the Caucasian or white race." After assuring the learner that "the Caucasian is the only truly historical race," Mr. Swinton confesses that "peoples outside the Caucasian have made some advances in civilization," and he instances the Chinese, Peruvians, and Mexicans, each simply by name, and with that he drops those three nations and their doings entirely out of account for the rest of his book, because, he says, "their civilization was stationary." The Japanese are likewise ignored, although they had been in open intercourse with the world twenty years when the book was in preparation, and had shown remarkable progress; nor does a word appear of their extraordinary experience with European civilization three centuries ago. Of Egypt and Chaldea, too, Mr. Swinton says, "They grew up and remained in a great degree apart from the rest of the world, having no considerable influence on the main current of history," just as was the case, he might have added, with each and every other nation of antiquity, until Greece had got well along, and so have left out all the rest of them; but, mindless of his own restricting qualifications, he soon inflicts upon the pupil the name and period of each of the twenty-six dynasties of Egypt, ending 332 B. C. Now, if there is anything Mr. Swinton detests in the guise of teaching, it is "a mere biog-

raphy of kings or the record of battles and sieges, of dynasties and courts," and "an array of isolated facts and dates," which, he affirms, his book does not contain; yet open it where you may, and within twenty pages, one way or the other, you run into just such a dry registry as he has described. Begin on page 285, for instance, and see how you are rushed along from the Carlovingian kings through the Franconians, catching a glimpse of the Hohenstaufens and a touch of the headache on the way, until you fetch up against the Austrian branch of the Hapsburg tree and are swung off into the long reign of Frederick III., which, as Mr. Swinton says, "carries us through the Middle Ages," and very much out of breath.

Go on eight pages farther, through sections of the reigning families of France, Germany, and England. He calls this passage "political outline"; it is little else than a catalogue of kings; this little else, however, gives the learner one remarkable piece of information — that "with the deposition by Parliament of Richard II., the Plantagenet line went out." Went out? How so? If those three Lancastrian kings who followed — the son, grandson, and great-grandson of John of Ghent — were not as regularly Plantagenets as Richard II., will Mr. Swinton, or any one of the thirty-two thousand Bostonians who are supposed abroad to have voted to restore his book to the schools, please explain why not? And the "roses" of the other color also; Richard III. was assuredly a lineal Plantagenet.

But we must not yet lose sight of those nations of antiquity; for although Mr. Swinton introduces several of them to us, only to kick them down-stairs for not belonging to "the only truly historical race," he still holds the pupils' noses down upon the grindstone of antiquity until they are half-way through the book. And he does not allow them to suspect there is a single doubtful point in history, from the

deluge down, except where he says that "in the prehistoric age we hear of the Pelasgi, who seem to have been an Aryan race." He announces straightly his own views as to all other peoples being Aryan or not, with sublime disregard of everlastingly different theories. Out of all excusable proportion, the first part of his book is given to alleged origins, tribal offshoots, wars, migrations, conquests, blendings, and mythical traditions of nationalities which, at their disappearance, had made no more "steps in human progress" than the Chinese, Japanese, Aztecs, or ancient Peruvians, all of whom the Boston school student may infer he should disdain to notice, because this book tells him "their civilization was stationary." Let me beg such of those students as may chance to read this to occupy some of their spare time perusing the works of one Prescott, deceased, a Bostonian, on the civilization and achievements of the ancient Mexicans and Peruvians; and to acquaint themselves with John L. Stephens's archæological researches in Central America and their results, and see if they do not find some "outlines of history" as valuable as Mr. Swinton's information that Charlemagne "dined off four dishes, and of roast venison newly killed and served up to him on the spit," or that Oliver Cromwell had a long nose. ("I will fight with him upon this theme until my eyelids will no longer wag"; for I have seen a cast of Cromwell's face, in the mint at Philadelphia, and the nasal protuberance is nothing more than an ordinary one; but this is a study by itself — the "outlines" of Cromwell's nose.)

Because the Romans began by suckling a wolf and improved upon themselves till they were able to build tremendous aqueducts, should the history pupil be deprived of the means of judging for himself as to the progress the Peruvians must have made to construct aqueducts incomparably stupendous to those of Rome? It can hardly be supposed they

entered upon their career tunnelling mountains of rock for aqueducts; perhaps they couldn't so much as find a she-wolf to begin with. The contributions to the world's history from all the peoples of the entire American continent, past and present, are excluded from Swinton's "Outlines," except incidentally in a very few instances as already mentioned. The eastern empire of Rome gets but little better attention, because, if we are to believe Mr. Swinton, its thousand years were devoid of progress! But it is of no consequence that that empire preserved the learning of Greece and Rome through the Dark Ages; that the code, which is the basis of European law at the present day, was established by Justinian; that Justinian, through his conquest of Italy, gave the first impulse to the growth of western civilization; that learned men from Constantinople, upon its capture by the Turks, were mainly instrumental in the revival of enlightenment throughout the West. More might be said of what the eastern empire did, taking "a general view of human progress," which we are told is the scope of the book. And where it tells the pupils that "the great feature of all the Oriental nations is their unprogressiveness," the teacher of the class should know enough to protest that the Phœnicians, who certainly were Orientals, were the world's pioneers in navigation, commerce, and the spreading of useful industries, and that through the Arabians we get most of our exact sciences.

[From the Boston *Transcript*, Feb. 8, 1889.]

Swinton's "Outlines" is a book of 487 pages. Its first 200 pages, or thereabout, — except those devoted to Greece and Rome, where history is too plain for the wayfaring man to err, — are largely filled with ethnological suppositions relative to various alleged branches of the Aryan language

stock and their foggy career, set down as veritable history, with some apparent confusion of ideas as to the Aryan migration into Europe. It is not until the class has gone through with 232 pages of antiquity, more or less vague, that it reaches the beginning of the empire under Charlemagne, and not until he gets to page 305 does the pupil come to the year 1500. Keeping in view the compiler's statement that his plan is to show the learner "what have been the great steps in human progress, the discoveries, . . . advances in thought," and so on, "that have carried forward civilization," and knowing that all such development, except a few incipient conditions for it, has come about in the past four centuries, what can be thought of a "method of teaching" that tries to crowd it all into the now remaining 182 pages of the book? A little more than one third of it is made to cover all modern history, from the discovery of America to, and including, the Franco-German war. If anything like *study* of the work is done, with the number of other studies usually undertaken, a whole school year might be gone before a class could get within sight of the sixteenth century.

Of necessity, therefore, the "general view of human progress," during the only four centuries that have seen any human progress to speak of, has to be sparingly and insufficiently given. "It is the brilliant figure of Spain that first attracts our attention at the beginning of modern history," says Mr. Swinton to his attentive pupils; and directly thereupon he treats them to one of his favorite doses of royal relationships among the European courts four centuries ago to show who was Charles V. There is but a mere suggestion of the great overflow of the Spanish nationality into the New World, all the way from California to Patagonia; and the series of revolutions in our country that terminated three centuries of Spanish and Portuguese domination on this con-

tinent, and erected a line of republics from Mexico to the Argentine, are apparently "crowded out for want of space," as the newspapers sometimes say. Anyway, so far as this book is concerned, the school pupil is cut off from any knowledge of those truly "great steps in human progress." The empire of Brazil — the nation having the largest contiguous territory of all in the world except Russia and the United States — is not so much as named, I believe; nor is the continent of Australia. Ten pages having been occupied with Assyria, there is room in the modern-history section for only ten lines to tell of the British conquest of India, bringing a hundred million people in contact with the forces "that have carried forward civilization." The settlement of Australia and New Zealand by "the only truly historical race," adding so widely to the civilized area of the globe, is not noticed at all. The gold discoveries of California and Australia, and their turning to those lands such streams of civilization as cannot be pictured elsewhere in modern history, are other events and movements of which those who learn from Swinton's "Outlines" are left in ignorance. But look back over the pages of time before Christ and after, and see the proportion of them occupied with comparative nothings and nobodies that had no more to do with "advances in thought that have carried forward civilization" than all the eclipses of the moon in the silurian period.

The reign of James I. of England "was not marked by what are called great events," says this school historian. It has been commonly supposed that the production of an authorized version of the Bible, by translation, was something that helped to "carry forward civilization," but no allusion to that work can be discovered. A page or so is covered with talk about the ungainly personal appearance and mental obliquities of that sovereign, but not a word appears of the one achievement that alone makes his reign historical.

The South Sea Bubble gets a good description, but if John Law's old swindle is an outline of history, why not "Old Hutch's" wheat corner of last August? The rectifying of the calendar was a much more important adjustment than many things that are duly explained, and it was effected solely by and for "the only historical race"; but when the pupil has left school and sees the puzzling letters O. S. or N. S. he will know nothing of the change from old style to new by anything Swinton's "Outlines" have told him.

. . . . . .

Turning for a moment to the primary one of the two histories of the United States, by the same educator, which are supposed to have educated the pupil in regard to this country before he starts upon the more extensive "Outlines," I do not turn six leaves before I find it stated that the first steamer to cross the Atlantic was the "Savannah," from New York to Liverpool. It is not a great matter, but if it is worth teaching it is worth stating correctly; the pioneer steamer, the "Savannah," sailed from Savannah to Liverpool; see "Life of Robert Fulton," by Thomas W. Knox; G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1886, page 321. A few pages more and it says that Washington died in the "last month of the last century." If Mr. Swinton were to begin with the first year of the first century, and count carefully to its last year, he would find the first century ended with the close of the year 100; and therefore the last month of the eighteenth century was December of the year 1800, and not December of 1799, the month of Washington's death. This belongs to an old, old class of blunders, demonstrated and corrected a thousand times; and for any person to fall into it shows a loose way of thinking. Telling of the Fourth of July, 1776, he says, "On that day this country became a nation"; and, when he gets to the war of 1812, it is considerably queer for him to say, "The United States were not twenty years old before

they had to go to war with England a second time." This, too, is only a question of arithmetic. One more of the many flaws in these earlier histories, as in the "Outlines." The documentary contentions and arguments that have broken out at long intervals in support and refutation of the alleged Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence (beginning in 1819, when John Adams and Thomas Jefferson first heard of it and expressed their incredulity of the Mecklenburg story) have left most people rather hopeless of ever learning the truth about it. But Mr. Swinton would not have our youth grow up to inherit a bothersome doubt upon any subject; he gives full credit to the Mecklenburgers' claim and no intimation of its ever having been disputed.

Not half the material Swinton's "Outlines" furnishes for showing strange things in history teaching has been used; enough has been shown, I think, to place the book within the application of the doctrine laid down by the *Transcript*, and quoted at the outset of this article; and that doctrine struck at simply one paragraph in another book, which, "being false, it is not a fit text-book for American youth." But not only should false statements condemn a text-book; statements so made as to lead to false inferences are as bad; so is teaching anything as an historical fact, which is, instead, a matter of historic doubt and dispute. Omissions of important matters and heedless blunders are but little less reprehensible. All these, and several of each, are counts in the indictment. Anderson's History may contain as many or more, and worse faults; I know nothing of that. I know, at least, four other books in the public schools in the United States that give out as much misinformation as Swinton's "Outlines." A well-informed and painstaking teacher may rectify much that is amiss in the "Outlines," but that is not to the credit of the book. It may be the best manual of history for school use now in print. If so, it is owing largely

to the remissness of the press in not watching and examining school-books as it does other publications, and it is a significant commentary on the ceaseless and critical attention bestowed by educators upon systems of preparation and methods of teaching, while neglecting to notice whether the information imparted is correct or not. It is not enough that teaching be skilfully done; what is taught should be true.

ALPHA CHILD.

WATERTOWN, N. Y., January, 1889.

THE TEACHING OF HISTORY.

[From the *Christian Register*, Nov. 8, 1888.]

The question how history shall be taught is one on which educators have had a good deal to say. In our progressive and most representative colleges, the method of studying it has been practically revolutionized in the last twenty-five years. We are more concerned now with the question as it relates to the study of history in our public schools. Much of the recent controversy has revolved around this point. Dr. Mayo revives it in his article in another column.

1. We agree with Dr. Mayo that the *well-attested facts* of history must be taught, not its fictions, not merely its traditions, but its facts. Geology, for instance, is one form of the study of history. It is the history of the physical development of our planet. In teaching it, let the facts be fully presented, and the causes, so far as they are revealed, without reference to any fond traditions which they may dispel. It is not, for instance, the business of the public-school teacher, in conducting a class in geology, to reconcile its facts with the cosmology of the Bible. Genesis teaches that the world was made in six days. Geology teaches that it has taken millions of years. It is this latter truth, sup-

ported as it is by myriads of facts, that the teacher has to present. If asked to explain the discrepancy between Genesis and geology, he may as well frankly tell the scholar that it is out of his province.

In a similar way, the teacher of astronomy, without reference to the prejudice of Brother Jasper, must teach his scholars that the earth moves on its axis. It is a doctrine which may conflict with the theological teaching of a few centuries ago. With this the teacher has nothing to do. If the scholar is properly impressed with the idea that the earth moves, he will probably conclude that the theologians who originally doubted it were mistaken. For this conclusion, the theologians, not the teacher, must be responsible. Or, if he be a teacher of physiology, he must teach his scholars the fact of the circulation of the blood. Here, again, he has to do with physiology, not with theology.

It is the advantage of teaching mathematics that its truth can be demonstrated. The indubitable facts of science can also be appealed to in support of its conclusions. If a boy doubts the circulation of the blood, the teacher with a microscope can show it to him in a frog's tongue. A single geological excursion would render it impossible to believe that the earth was made in six days; and the proof that the earth is round and revolves on its axis can be demonstrated to his reason, if not to his sight. But, when we enter the field of human history — the history of kingdoms, nations, revolutions, religions, the growth of society, the development of opinions — we enter a different field. The facts of history here are not always so tangible. They are sometimes vague and illusive. Motives and actions are complex, evidence is conflicting, documents are not always veracious. Here, again, we may say with Dr. Mayo, "Teach the *facts* of history"; but the important question arises, *What* facts? Especially, what facts shall we present in the very brief

abridgment of history to which the course in the public schools is confined? A great deal of mischief may be done simply with bald facts. A teacher may claim that the separate facts he is presenting to his scholars are true; but, when we come to examine them, we may see that they are facts *out of their proper relations*. There are some subjects which cannot be treated adequately unless they are treated broadly. Indeed, it is more accurate and more satisfactory to say that we are to teach the *truth of history* instead of simply its facts. In the truth of history, as in the truth of geology, a vast number of facts and influences may need to be considered.

The recent discussion in regard to indulgences, which suggests Dr. Mayo's article, will readily furnish an illustration. The subject of indulgences is introduced in a public-school text-book. A scholar who is not satisfied with the definition given asks his teacher. The teacher replies in effect that indulgences are permissions to commit sin, and examination papers show that this impression has been made upon the minds of his pupils. The indignation of a portion of the religious community is justly excited. But here the Protestant rises, and tells us that the facts of history must be taught. Yes; but we demand that they must be taught accurately. The definition of the teacher was erroneous, and the definition in the book which excited the question was partial and incomplete. That the shameful practice of selling indulgences by pardon-hawkers, like Tetzel and others, aroused Huss and Luther to protest, and was thus the exciting cause of the Reformation, cannot be denied. That is a fact of history; but there are other facts that need to be told with it, in order to present the *truth* of history. And one of these facts, which ought not to be separated from the other, is that the Christian Church never authoritatively taught that an indulgence was a permission to

commit sin, that its doctrine was that of the remission of temporal penalties after sins had been confessed and repented of. The abuses consequent on the easy corruption of this doctrine only make it more necessary to bring out the original attitude of the Church itself.

Lea, in his "History of the Inquisition," treats the subject of indulgences very fully and without partiality for the Roman Catholic side. If any one needs a justification of the origin of Protestantism, he may find it in these volumes. Yet Lea shows us how often the Church itself had protested against the abuses perpetrated in its name. The average Protestant opinion is that Huss and Luther were the first to protest against these practices. But Lea says: —

"Alexander III., about 1175, expressed his disapproval of these corruptions." (Vol. I., page 41.) "Already, in 1215, the great Council of Lateran inveighs bitterly against these practices. . . . As early as 1261, the Council of Mainz can hardly find words strong enough to denounce the pestilent sellers of indulgences, whose knavish tricks excite the hatred of all men, who spend their filthy gains in vile debauchery, and who so mislead the faithful that confession is neglected on the ground that sinners have purchased forgiveness of their sins." (Vol. I., page 46.)

Nor must it be forgotten that the history of indulgences runs clear back to the fourth century.

While we are confident that a full and complete study of the subject of indulgences, with all the corruptions which have attended it, will justify on the ground of reason and ethics those who refuse to accept it, yet we contend that a public school is no place for the vindication of the Protestant position. Protestants may be perfectly confident from their stand-point that a certain view of indulgences is right. On the other hand, more than fifty per cent of our school children belong to families who take a very different view of the facts of history. This is a subject which cannot be demon-

strated like the circulation in a frog's tongue; it is a matter of evidence and opinion. It must be referred to the larger field of ecclesiastical history, and Protestants have nothing to lose by leaving it there.

Let us for a moment put the shoe on the Protestant foot, and see just where it pinches. This discussion has had reference to the *causes* of the Reformation. Suppose now we look at some of the *results* of the Reformation.

Rev. Dr. Philip Schaff, of the Union Theological Seminary, New York, is a Protestant historian. His orthodoxy is not questioned. In the sixth volume of his "Ecclesiastical History," just published, Dr. Schaff has the following passage:

"The fact is undeniable that the Reformation in Germany was accompanied and followed by Antinomian tendencies and a degeneracy of public morals. It rests not only on the hostile testimonies of Romanists and Separatists, but Luther and Melanchthon themselves often bitterly complained in their later years of the abuse of the liberty of the gospel and the sad state of morals in Wittenberg and throughout Saxony."

Prof. George P. Fisher, of Yale, in his volume on "The History of the Christian Church," referring to the abuses which succeeded the Reformation, says, "In the Netherlands, in the time of Charles V., Anabaptists were guilty of offences against decency and morality, which were repaid with savage penalties." (Page 425.) Again, referring to the Familists: "They made a stir in England in the reign of Elizabeth. Some of them are allowed to have been pure and devout. Others were accused of lax, licentious practices, — the result of a mystical Antinomianism." (Page 427.)

Hase, in his "History of the Christian Church," speaking of the reaction of individualism which followed the Reformation, says:

"These Anabaptists, who made their first appearance at Zwickau and Wittenberg (1521), were nearly all put to death in the Peasants' War; but, in almost every part of the country, a class of enthusiasts resembling them, but very unlike each other in moral and religious character, became the pioneers and freebooters of the Reformation. Some of them were persons who had renounced the world, and others were the slaves of their own lusts. To some of them, marriage was only an ideal religious communion of spirit. To others, it was resolved into a general community of wives. . . . They justified themselves by isolated passages of the Bible for overthrowing all existing relations in social life. In their assumed character of men moved by the Holy Ghost, they were of course exalted above all law, and frequently exhibited a spirit of rebellion against every kind of government." (Page 431.)

Mosheim gives us a detailed picture of the "scenes of violence, tumult, and sedition that were exhibited in Holland" by what he calls "this odious tribe."

It cannot be denied that the reaction against the authority of the Pope, and also the proclamation of Luther's doctrine of justification by faith, had a great deal to do in exciting a fanatical and infuriated rabble, who became the anarchists of that day. Even Huss was compelled to mourn the want of morality of many of his adherents.

Now, if Protestants may demand that the *cause* of the Reformation shall be ascribed in our school-books to the corruption of the Christian Church, why shall not Catholics demand that the corruption of the Christian Church, which was one *result* of the Reformation, shall be inserted in the same book? One is a fact of history quite as much as the other. If one is to be taught, in all fairness the other should be taught also. But we imagine how many Protestants would wince at having Dr. Schaff's statement inserted in Mr. Swinton's book, declaring that "the fact is undeniable that the Reformation in Germany was followed . . . by a degeneracy of public morals."

If such a statement should be inserted in a school-book, we should be among the first to protest, on the ground that this statement, though a fact of history, does not present the whole truth of history. Is it fair to state the terrible abuses of Luther's doctrine without stating the sense in which he held it, without making the fact known that he himself protested against these very perversions? Would it be fair to describe the moral degeneracy following the Reformation without also describing the grand and inestimable results which also flowed from it? Not all the Anabaptists even were fanatical and immoral. One cannot do justice to this sect without recognizing the purity of character and nobility of the Mennonites who grew from it.

But more important than the teaching of the simple facts of history, for which Dr. Mayo contends, is *the development of the historic spirit.* The teacher who was asked by a scholar what an indulgence meant, had an excellent opportunity. Instead of giving an erroneous and one-sided definition, he had an opportunity to impress upon his pupils that here is a question concerning which Protestants and Catholics differ, that it was not his business to decide debatable points for his pupils. Or he might have asked his Catholic pupils to get from their religious advisers their own definition of indulgences. Or he might have referred them to the most prominent Catholic and Protestant writers, and allowed them to form their own opinions. Far more valuable than pouring into their minds mutilated and fragmentary facts of history would be the development of this judicial, investigating spirit. A teacher of tact and fairness might have made an impression of tolerance and impartiality worth more to the pupil than a ton of Swinton's one-sided books. The best work that is now done in our colleges is that in which historic themes are assigned to students, with copious reference to authors on both sides, with the expectation that the

student himself shall sift, analyze, compare, and adjudicate. It may be too early in the public schools to do this to any large extent. But it may be done to some extent; and the more, the better. What a child should commit to memory is simply the *events* of history. The study of causes, motives, and influences may properly be referred to a riper period.

Finally, we remind our readers that a book intended for a text-book in the public schools must be tried by tests which may not be applied to a book for the individual student. Catholics, Protestants, Jews, and children of all nations gather in these schools. A book which does not carefully avoid all religious and national partiality ought to be carefully excluded as a source of strife and division.

THE DOCTRINE OF INDULGENCES.

[Extract from editorial in the Boston *Advertiser*, of May 12, 1888, under the above caption.]

Finally, wholly apart from the merits of the present case [that of Mr. Travis, teacher of history in the English High School], which cannot be decided until more facts are known, it is well to emphasize two things. One is, that during the Middle Ages, in times of gross ignorance, violence, and moral degradation, there grew up many practices in connection with the Roman Catholic Church which never had the sanction of the Church authorities, and which Popes and Councils endeavored to reform. The doctrine of indulgences was perverted along with other doctrines. . . . But the uniform testimony of the most eminent Protestant authorities of the present day is in accord with the words quoted in another column from that distinguished church historian, Prof. Fisher, of Yale College: "To say that the Roman Catholic

Church has ever taught that the forgiveness of sins can be bought with money is an atrocious slander." If Mr. Travis has taught the pupils of the English High School in Boston, as an historical fact or a theological argument, that in the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church an "indulgence" is a permission to commit sin, he is to be severely blamed. Historically, the statement is not true; theologically, the topic is forbidden in the public schools.

INDULGENCES AGAIN.

[From the Boston *Daily Advertiser*, May 16, 1888.]

In stating on Saturday last the doctrine of "indulgences" as taught by the Roman Catholic Church, we simply summarized the definition of that doctrine which the authorities of that Church have given, and which is to be found in all their official utterances on the subject. In so doing we called attention to certain facts which are as well authenticated as any facts recorded in history. There is no doubt among competent scholars concerning the main points at issue. To cite all the authorities in proof of our statements, would be to present a catalogue of all the standard books on church history. But for the satisfaction of any persons who may desire to look into the question for themselves, and in reply to the letter of an intelligent correspondent, we cite a few authorities which can be readily referred to. The "Library of Universal Knowledge," Vol. VII., page 876, states that,

"Indulgence, in Roman Catholic theology, means a remission by church authority to a repentant sinner of the temporal punishment, which, in the Catholic theory, remains due after the sin and its eternal punishment have been remitted."

The "Encyclopedia Britannica," Vol. XII., page 847, says:

"It must be carefully borne in mind that, in Roman Catholic orthodoxy, indulgence is never absolutely gratuitous, and that

those can only, in any circumstances, validly receive it who are in full communion with the Church, and have resorted to the sacrament of penance, in which alone, after due contrition and confession, provision is made for the remission of the graver penalty of sin."

The "American Encyclopedia," Vol. IX., page 256, says:

"In no supposable case can indulgence be a pardon for the guilt of sin."

The foregoing are standard works of general information, of undisputed authority. The plan of their editors has been to have each topic treated by a writer who could speak as an expert upon it. The above citations show conclusively what an indulgence is as held and taught by the Roman Catholic Church. With most people these quotations will be accepted as answering the question, "What is an indulgence?" But if any one wishes to insist that we cannot trust those who teach a doctrine to tell what that doctrine is, we would refer him to a brief list of standard works prepared by evangelical Protestants, and indorsed by the most learned men of every Protestant sect, all of which works confirm in every particular the statement of the *Advertiser*.

The "Dictionary of Religious Knowledge," prepared by Dr. Lyman Abbott, a learned Congregationalist, with the assistance of Dr. T. J. Conant, whom all Baptists revere as one of their foremost scholars, is a work relied on by tens of thousands of Sunday-school teachers. This book says, page 459:

"Indulgences, in the Roman Catholic Church, are not a permission to sin, but a remission of what are termed the temporal penalties of sin."

The "Religious Encyclopedia" is a recent work prepared originally by Prof. Herzog, of Germany, and edited in this country by Dr. Philip Schaff, a Presbyterian, and chairman

of the American branch of the Bible revision committee which prepared its new version of the Scriptures. Associated with Dr. Schaff in the editing of the encyclopedia are more than one hundred Protestant clergymen, mostly doctors of divinity, many of them professors in colleges and theological seminaries, and altogether representing every Protestant denomination of any note in Europe and America. In Vol. II, page 1076, of this work, the student will find the subject of indulgences treated, and he will find not one word in support of the assertion that an indulgence is a permission to commit sin.

Not to weary the reader, we will cite but one more authority. The Methodist denomination will gladly assent to the remark that no class of Protestants are more conscientiously and vigorously opposed to Catholicism than are the followers of John Wesley. McClintock and Strong's "Biblical Cyclopedia" is everywhere a standard authority with clergymen and laymen of that church, having been compiled throughout under the direction of the two eminent Methodist divines whose names are on the title-page, with the co-operation of the most learned men in all the principal denominations. The article on indulgences is on pages 563–568, of Vol. IV. It deals with the subject from every point of view, historical, doctrinal, practical, and scriptural. The entire treatment is in the nature of the strongest possible truthful opposition to the Catholic Church. Yet, from first to last, McClintock and Strong make no statement which gives any color to what Prof. Fisher calls "the atrocious slander" involved in the traditional accusation.

THE PUBLIC-SCHOOL QUESTION.

BY CHARLES KENDALL ADAMS.

The public-school question, as it now confronts us, is undoubtedly one of very great importance, and the recent agitation in Boston, consequent upon the exclusion of Swinton's "Outlines of the World's History" from the public schools, affords an appropriate occasion for a careful inspection of the ground on which the friends of the public-school system are ready to take and defend their position. Such a survey necessarily involves the discussion of a number of questions. There are, doubtless, some who distrust the assumption that the public-school system is better adapted to serve the interests of the community and of the State than a system of parochial schools would be; but, in spite of this fact, it is probably safe to assume that the schools are as permanently established as any other part of our institutions. The question, then, as to whether our public schools shall be dispensed with, is not one in regard to which there can be any profitable discussion. But as soon as we come to an examination of details, we find room for a difference of opinion. A vast number of questions arise: some of them concerning organization, others concerning qualifications of teachers, and still others concerning the subjects to be taught. Nearly all of these questions are amenable to settlement in the ordinary methods that must be applied to administrative details. But the question that now confronts us is one that calls for a different manner of treatment. It involves, not simply the subordinate matter of efficiency, but the far more fundamental one of the object to be attained. Is the object of the public schools the teaching of religious truth? We should probably all agree to answer the question in the negative, excepting so far as such teaching may be necessary for

the building up of that form of character which we deem essential to the most successful fulfilment of the public duties of life. Is the teaching of religion in any form an indispensable part of the child's public education? If it is not, it follows, of course, that as soon as any considerable objection is made to it, we may dispense with it from our schools without any special embarrassment. If, on the other hand, it is an indispensable part of the most successful education, then another question arises, namely, whether it should be made a part of education in our public schools, or whether it should be left to be provided for in some other way. The question then narrows itself to this: Shall the teaching of religion, in so far as it is to be taught at all, be provided for in our public schools, or shall it be left to the voluntary efforts of private schools, churches, families, and individuals?

It is undoubtedly going too far to say that this country was founded on the idea of political and religious freedom. The Puritans were not tolerant of what they regarded as heresy. To use Franklin's figure, we may say that they were strenuous believers in their own "doxy," and that they were equally strenuous disbelievers in the "doxy" of anybody else. No one of them had the courage and wit to say, with Sydney Smith, that he never should be perfectly happy till he had dined off a roasted Quaker; but that seems to have been about the way very many of them felt. Nor was this feeling confined to New England. There was a kindred intolerance in the South. The settlers of this country were undoubtedly advancing toward religious freedom; but they had yet a long road to travel before they could reach the goal. But, nevertheless, there was but one ending to the road on which they had entered. As the country came to be filled up with differing peoples and sects, there was absolutely no other way than either to live in interminable discord, or to agree to live in absolute toleration and peace.

Our forefathers wisely chose the latter alternative. And so, when the State Constitutions and the national Constitution came to be adopted, the only logical course was to exclude entirely from the domain of political and governmental consideration all questions of religious profession and belief. In the Constitution of the United States, and in the Constitutions of the individual States, laws discriminating against any particular form of belief or disbelief are, as a rule, prohibited. In general, it may be said that ever since the formation of the government, persons of any form of religious belief, and persons of any form of disbelief, have been equally eligible to any of the political offices in the gift of government or the people. This is tantamount to a constitutional declaration, or at least admission, that no one form of belief or disbelief is essential to the successful performance of the duties of any political office. If not essential to an officer, still less would any particular form of belief seem to be necessary to a private citizen.

This line of reasoning brings us to the obvious necessity of erecting a barrier against any obligatory religious instruction whatever. Indeed, such instruction can logically be required only in a State which officially recognizes some particular form of religious belief. Our constitutional limitations on this subject, therefore, are but the natural expression of positive necessity.

We are brought still more obviously to the same conclusion in another way. Even if we were to admit the necessity of teaching some form of religious truth in our schools, the question would at once confront us as to what form we should teach. And the moment the question is raised we are brought face to face with the fact that in our body politic there is no one set of men authorized to answer it. Shall a majority answer it? But there is no way in which a majority can possibly perform so complicated an act as to exercise dis-

criminating judgment upon the countless details of a great body of religious doctrine. But even if it were claimed that such a judgment could be exercised by chosen representatives, there would still be the embarrassing fact that there are a hundred forms of belief; in other words, that there would be a hundred tickets in the field at the same election, and on the same question. Either the question would have to be stripped of all those details which constitute the characteristics of the different religious denominations, and thus be reduced to a question of simple morality, or it would be absolutely necessary that a hundred questions should be submitted at once, and, consequently, that the right to decide between them should be conferred on a mere plurality. But a plurality is often a minority. If a mere plurality were given the privilege of deciding such a question, the inevitable result would ensue that, occasionally at least, a minority would have the privilege of enforcing obnoxious doctrines upon the majority. Would such a result be tolerated? In a community where a plurality, let us say, are Unitarians, would Trinitarians consent to have their children taught doctrines that are sharply opposed to the Trinity? Would Protestants submit to have their children taught the doctrines of Catholics merely because Catholics happened, in a given district or city, to be more numerous than any other religious body? The answer is too obvious to require hesitation.

But even if we were to allow the matter to be determined by a clear majority, we should not be released from logical difficulties. However it may have been during the colonial period, it is certainly true that ever since we became a united government under the Constitution we have persistently and systematically denied to a majority the right to impose any particular form of religious belief upon a minority. To demand that this fundamental principle, which has, in fact, become a part of the bone and fibre of our people,

should be set aside, is simply to ask our civilization to face about and march in the opposite direction; for if there is anything which the civilization of the last three hundred years has been saying in louder tones than anything else, it is that a majority has no right to force its religious beliefs on a minority. This carries with it also the postulate that no one man has a right to enforce his beliefs on any one of his fellow-men. Just as truly it follows that no one man, or body of men, has a right to enforce certain beliefs upon the children of other men. And unless we hold that, when we elect a school board, we give them religious as well as educational supervision over our children, it follows that neither school board nor teacher has any right to impose, as an obligation, any particular form of religious belief on any pupil.

Any other position than this, besides being illogical, must result in inextricable confusion. Indeed, any other doctrine than this cannot fail ultimately to break up our public-school system. Any other doctrine would give to a Protestant community, for example, the right to teach its own beliefs in regard to transubstantiation, and indulgences, and the confessional; and such teaching would, of course, drive all Catholics out of the schools. In a Catholic community the opposite party would be driven out, but the general result would be the same. Disaster must follow such a policy, simply for the reason that, if there is any one thing to which a man will not submit, it is to have his children taught religious doctrines which he believes to be at once false and pernicious. It is evident that so long as this is the case, the only possible way for parents who differ from one another on religious subjects, is either to have nothing whatever to do with one another in the matter of schools, or for each to withdraw absolutely from the schools those doctrines that are offensive to the other. The first means the abandonment of our public schools, as a system, and the substitu-

tion of private schools in their places; the second means the reduction of our public schools to a purely secular basis.

Those who agree with the positions thus set forth will have no difficulty in applying them to the solution of the dispute now raging in Boston. The point at issue is not a mere question as to the historic accuracy of Swinton's account of the Reformation; it is, whether the account given has a color which may reasonably be regarded as inaccurate and offensive by the parents of Catholic children. While it might not be easy to point out a single positive misstatement in Swinton's narrative, the general impression inevitably left on the pupil's mind is one of strong bias in opposition to the Catholic Church, and in favor of Luther. It may tell the truth, but it does not tell the whole truth; and this is equivalent to saying that it tells a partial truth, and presents it in such a way as at least to have the effect of a partial falsehood. It preaches the Protestant doctrine; it omits to preach the Catholic doctrine. To any one who has received his knowledge of the Reformation solely from that combination of careless scholarship and slovenly enthusiasm known as D'Aubigné's "History of the Reformation," this statement may seem hardly correct; but every one who has looked more carefully into the history of this period knows that there is a side of the question of altogether another color. For example, Luther was so far from condemning indulgences that the seventy-first of his famous ninety-five theses pronounced a curse upon any one who should question their truth or value. Then again, six months after the posting of the theses, he wrote to the Pope in these submissive terms:

"Most Holy Father, I cast myself at the feet of Your Holiness, with all that I am and all that I have. Give life, take it away; call, recall; approve, reprove; your voice is that of Christ, who dwells in you, and speaks by your lips. If I have deserved death, I am ready to die."

It was on this submission of his case that Luther was tried and condemned. It is, of course, easy for us to say that he ought not to have been condemned; but it is evident that by the attitude Luther took, and held, up to the time of his condemnation, he laid himself open to the charge of breaking with the authority of the Church, simply because the Church condemned him. And this is, in substance, what Catholic historians have generally taught. They hold that what Luther did was substantially what the well-known lawyer did who said that when he was beaten there was only one of two courses open to him, either to appeal or to damn the court. The Catholic doctrine, in substance, is that Luther could not appeal from the decision of the papal bull, and that, therefore, he resorted to the other alternative. That this view of the case is believed to be the correct one by a great many honest minds, there is no doubt whatever; and to compel a person who does take this view of the case to send his children to a school, or to be taxed for a school, where the Protestant view, and the Protestant view alone, is taught, is as unjustifiable and absurd as it would be to force Protestants into a similar position, if at some time the Catholics should get the upper hand, and the tables should be turned. And, if under such circumstances, Protestants would not submit, it is simply rank injustice to demand that Catholics shall submit, simply because the power at present happens to be in Protestant hands. Thus we are forced to the conclusion that in our public schools we must give to our instruction no more of theological color than we give to our courts and legislatures. The responsibility of all religious instruction, if we are to preserve a harmonious support of our institutions, must be left to the churches, to the families, and to voluntary individual effort. And there it may be left with entire safety.

THE END.

"Damnable falsehood" is Mr. Cooke's characterization of certain statements of Sadlier. This is a sonorous phrase, but expletives are not proofs. The evidence of the falsity of the two statements quoted on page 101, from Sadlier's "History of the United States," is, Mr. Cooke tells us, "known to many intelligent persons." Among these "many intelligent persons," Mr. Cooke himself, no doubt, stands foremost, and the others are presumably those familiar friends of Mr. Cooke, his "unbiased historians." Their excess of knowledge recalls the keen-edged remark of a popular American humorist, who says, "It is better not to know so much than to know so many things that are not so."

The two statements cited from Sadlier's "History" are neither damnable nor any other kind of falsehoods; they are the sober truth of history, and to call them "damnable falsehoods" is to betray crass ignorance or something worse. The first statement, that "the only systematic and successful attempts to civilize and Christianize the Indians were made by Catholic missionaries," is sustained by historical authorities, whose testimony cannot be shaken by Mr. Cooke's uninstructed and misinstructed pen. These authorities show that wherever a Catholic colony was planted on this continent systematic efforts were at once begun and persistently continued to Christianize and civilize the native tribes. That these were the "only" systematic successful attempts is well known. Many non-Catholic religious bodies also made efforts to evangelize the Indians, but those efforts were neither comprehensive nor permanent; compared with the early, extensive, well-organized, and permanent Catholic missions they cannot be regarded as systematic, and judged by their final results they were certainly not successful. To quote only a few writers, of whom Mr. Cooke may perhaps have heard, there is Washington Irving, who says:

"All persons who are in the least familiar with the early history of the West, know with what pure and untiring zeal the Catholic missionaries pursued the work of conversion among the savages. Before a Virginian had crossed the Blue Ridge, and while the Connecticut was still the extreme frontier of New England, more than one man whose youth had been passed among the warm valleys of Languedoc had explored the wilds of Wisconsin, and caused the hymn of Catholic praise to rise from the prairies of Illi-

nois. The Catholic priest went even before the soldier and the trader; from lake to lake, from river to river, the Jesuits pressed on unresting, and, with a power which no other Christians have exhibited, won to their faith the warlike Miamis and luxurious Illinois."

Rev. Mr. Kip, a Protestant minister, bears his testimony to the Catholic missionaries and their success in these terms:

"How few of their number died the common death of all men! But did these things stop the progress of the Jesuits? The sons of Loyola never retreated. The mission they founded in a tribe ended only with the extinction of the tribe itself. Their lives were made up of fearless devotedness and heroic self-sacrifice. Though sorrowing for the dead, they pressed forward at once to occupy their places, and, if needs be, share their fate."

"Long before the consecration of Plymouth Rock," observes Mr. Bartlett, an official of the United States government, "the religion of Christ had been made known to the Indians of New Mexico; the Rocky Mountains were scaled; and the Gila and Colorado rivers, which in our day are attracting so much interest as novelties, were passed again and again. The broad continent, too, to cross which, with all the advantages we possess, requires a whole season, was traversed from ocean to ocean, before Raleigh, or Smith, or the Pilgrim Fathers had touched our shores."

Miss Harriet Martineau and Mrs. Jameson, both Protestant women of note, have also borne witness to the superior effectiveness of Catholic missions among the Indians. Judge Hall, of Cincinnati, a Protestant, has this to say:

"The French Catholics, at a very early period, were remarkably successful in gaining converts, and conciliating the confidence and affection of the tribes; while Protestants, similarly situated, were bloodthirsty and rapacious."

Berkeley, the famous Protestant Bishop, writing from actual observation on this continent, said:

"The Spanish missionaries in the South, and the French in the North, are making such a progress as may one day spread the religion of Rome throughout all the savage nations in America."

It has been truly observed on this forecast of Bishop Berkeley that "in South America the work which he dreaded is done and if in North America they failed to convert all the savage tribes, it was only because England massacred both them and their flocks, till she left them none to convert."

The enduring success of the Catholic missions has been attested by many eminent writers. "At Kaskaskia, far away in the valley of the Mississippi," Mr. Bancroft says, "the success of the mission was such, that marriages of the French emigrants were sometimes solemnized with the daughters of the Illinois according to the rites of the Catholic Church," while the Indians, he allows, were so thoroughly converted, that not only did they all assemble "at early dawn" to assist at mass, and again "at evening, for instruction, for prayer, and to chant the hymns of the Church, . . . every convert confessed once in a fortnight," and "at the close of the day, parties would meet in the cabins to recite the rosary, in alternate choirs, and sing psalms into the night." By the end of the seventeenth century, as Mr. Owen observes, "the total of the Confederacy (Six Nations) who professed the Roman Catholic religion was computed to exceed eight thousand." And this was but one instance of the success of Catholic missions.

The unsuccessful character of the Protestant missions is strikingly illustrated by their results, as recorded by Protestant writers, and acknowledged by the missionaries themselves. Hildreth, the historian, says, "Eliot's scheme, for civilizing and Christianizing the Indians proved in the end an almost total failure."

The historian Sparks, in his biography of Eliot, says, "The natives of our forests derived no permanent benefit from the exertions of Mr. Eliot and others." And that Eliot himself fully realized his failure we have the witness of Conyers, another biographer, who relates that just before his death Eliot spoke of the dark cloud upon his work among the Indians.

That the Quakers were equally unsuccessful, we have the testimony of Bancroft, who says: "The Quakers came among the Delawares in the spirit of peace and brotherly love, and with sincerest wishes to benefit the Indian; but the Quakers succeeded no better than the Puritans — not nearly as well as the Jesuits."* That the Catholic missions were the only successful as well as systematic attempts to Christianize the Indians is attested by John Gilmary Shea, whose authority on the subject of Indian history is so well recognized that he was chosen to write the articles on the North American Indians which appear in that standard work of reference, "Appleton's American Cyclopedia."

He says in his "History of the Catholic Indian Missions," "that

* See Marshall's "Christian Missions."

the tribes evangelized by the French and Spaniards subsist to this day, except where brought in contact with the colonists of England, and their allies or descendants; while it is notorious that the tribes in the territory colonized by England have in many cases entirely disappeared and perished without ever having had the gospel preached to them. The Abnakis, Caughnawagas, Kaskaskias, Miamis, Ottawas, Chippeways, Arkansas, and the New Mexican tribes remain, and number faithful Christians; but where are the Pequods, Narragansetts, the Mohegans, the Mattowax, the Lenape, the Powhattans? They live only in name in the rivers and mountains of our land."

It will be in order to present other authorities sustaining this position after Mr. Cooke has furnished the "every kind of evidence" of the falsity of Sadlier's statement which, as he says, is "known to many intelligent persons."

CATHOLIC AID TO AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE.

Sadlier's statement that "the independence of the United States was, in a great degree, secured by Catholic blood, talent, and treasure" is abundantly justified by the undisputed records of the Revolutionary epoch. If Mr. Cooke has not heard of the many and heavy sacrifices made by Catholics to the patriot cause in 1775 and all through the war for independence, nor of the incalculably valuable contribution to the success of that war made by France and Spain, the two great Catholic countries of Europe, it is in order to inquire where he received his education, that we may know and avoid the school in which he received his rations of elementary history. Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, is known in every reputable history as one of the leading Revolutionary spirits; his name is among the immortal signers of the great Declaration of 1776. He was the grand representative of his fellow Catholics who stood in solid array for American liberty and independence, side by side with the Protestant patriots of Massachusetts and other States. As soon as Lexington gave the signal, Catholics volunteered for the American patriot army in large numbers. If they were not found in much larger numbers in the ranks, the fact has its obvious explanation in another fact, namely, that severe penal laws against Catholics were still on the statute books of every

American colony. In 1775, Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, was the first Catholic permitted to hold any public office in Maryland, since the days of James II. Yet, in spite of the prevailing proscription of Catholics, the roll-call of distinguished American Revolutionary soldiers and sailors bears many honored Catholic names. The Catholic Indian tribes, by the way, rendered signal services to the Continental army. Orono, Me., is named to this day in memory of the Catholic Indian chieftain who brought the Penobscots to the support of the American cause, while the heathen Mohawks were helping the English army by their savage atrocities.

The Northwestern territory was saved to the American cause as much by the heroic efforts and sacrifices of Rev. Peter Gibault, the Catholic priest of Kaskaskia, as by those of any other man. It was an attempt to capture Detroit, the centre of the English atrocities in the way of savage warfare, that La Balm and nearly the whole of his little Catholic force perished in 1780. Is it possible that Mr. Cooke has never heard of the large numbers of Catholic military officers who, on the outbreak of the Revolutionary War, flocked from Europe, to throw their swords into the scale against England? Their bravery and their sacrifices are part of the military record of every important battle of the Revolution, and the names of LaFayette, DeKalb, Kosciusko, and Pulaski are but the best remembered of a great company of Catholic chieftains who rendered services to the American cause of incalculable value. Green, in his "Historical View of the American Revolution," says:

"One of the serious wants of our army, and which no native genius or rapid training could immediately supply, was the want of engineers. Washington's complaints of the incompetence of even the few who claimed the name, began with his first letter from Cambridge to the president of Congress, and a year later he wrote to the Pennsylvania Committee of Safety that he had but one in whom he could place confidence. Here the necessity of looking to Europe for assistance was so apparent, that Congress directed the Commissioners at Paris to engage competent engineers, with the approbation of the French court, and with the assurance of proper rank and pay. It was to this judicious resolution that we owe the services of Duportail, Launoy, Radiere, and Gouvion, officers of good standing in the French army, and who brought us what we needed most, science, combined with practical skill. It was under their direction that most of the important works of the war, from 1777 to its close, were constructed."

The first commodore of the American navy, the man who first taught England to fear American prowess on the seas, was the Catholic Barry, whom Lord Howe in vain attempted to bribe to desert the patriotic cause. Nor have I ever, before Mr. Cooke essayed to do so, heard the fact questioned that the Catholic aid received from France and Spain was largely the cause of American success in the Revolutionary War. Not only officers, but arms and munitions of war, were sent from the government armories and stores of Catholic France. Marie Antoinette was a strong friend of the American cause, and won the king over fully to its support.

The first recognition of the united American colonies as a nation was by Catholic France in February, 1778, and soon after French armies and fleet were moving to Washington's assistance. France's two great and all-important contributions to the American cause were her fleet and her money; the first broke the British command of the seas; the second kept the American patriot armies in the field. Stone states, in his work on "French Allies," that "the support of the American cause by the French cost the government of Louis XVI. one billion four hundred million livres" (or about $280,000,000). The same author quotes the statement made by the Prince de Joinville, that "in the war of the American Revolution, France lost thirty-five thousand men and twenty-five ships of the line." All this loss did not of course occur in America, nor in the waters of the United States, but was an aggregate growing out of the alliance with the American Confederacy. That acknowledged authority, Appleton's "Encyclopedia," says: "The war of Independence would have been an ignominious failure but for foreign loans, and these were made mostly by France." Washington, amid the sufferings of Valley Forge, issued a general order directing a national thanksgiving to God for the timely and important aid of France.

The ports of Catholic Spain, as well as of Catholic France, were friendly bases of supplies for American privateers. From New Orleans, then a Spanish city, supplies for our armies were sent. From Catholic Madrid there came at another critical time blankets for ten regiments and a money gift. Later Spain also openly declared war against England in support of the Revolutionary cause, and the capture of Baton Rouge in September, 1780, and later of Pensacola, were two tremendous blows to British power

for which we owe thanks to the Catholic fleet of Spain under Galvez. It was by Spain's good offices and skilful diplomacy that Russia was detached from England, and Holland induced to take common cause with the American colonies. Thus on land and on sea alike Catholic friendship, valor, skill, and money conduced most powerfully to the final triumph of the American cause at Yorktown. Mr. Cooke appears not to know this, and ignorantly presumes to say that Sadlier is guilty of "damnable falsehood." But Gen. Washington was not given to lying, and he has left on record his endorsement of Sadlier's statement on this point. In his "After Orders," issued Oct. 20 (the day following the victory of Yorktown), Gen. Washington recognizes "the generous proofs which His Most Christian Majesty (the Catholic king of France) has given of his attachment to the cause of America," which "must force conviction on the minds of the most deceived of the enemy relative to the good consequences of the alliance, and inspire every citizen of the States with sentiments of the most unalterable gratitude." He acknowledges the eminent services of the fleet commanded by an admiral whose fortune and talents insure great events," and of "an army of the most admirable composition both in officers and men." Replying, on a later occasion, to an address by Catholics, the Father of his Country said, "I presume that your fellow-citizens will not forget the patriotic part which you took in the accomplishment of their revolution and the establishment of their government, or the important assistance which they received from a nation in which the Roman Catholic faith is professed." In view of this declaration by Gen. Washington, the highest possible contemporary authority, Mr. Cooke's blustering assertion that Sadlier tells a "damnable falsehood" when he states that American independence "was in a great degree secured by Catholic blood, talent, and treasure," must clearly be set down alongside the many other exhibitions of assurance with which he has seen fit to disfigure this discussion.

R. J. J.

OPPRESSION OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN SWITZERLAND.

Here we have another evidence of Mr. Cooke's poor equipment as a critic of historical text-books. The statement at which he assumes to sneer is absolutely true, and his sneer simply convicts him of an utter lack of acquaintance with contemporary Swiss history. As a contribution to his sadly neglected education on this matter, I will state that in the single canton of Ticino, the Catholic Church could not have fared much worse if it had been under a Russian government. Flourishing religious houses, with their schools, have been swept away at Ascona, Lugano, Mendrisie, and Bellinzona; the diocesan seminary was forcibly suppressed at Pollegio. Parish priests have been driven from their parishes, and others, under the censures of the Church, intruded in their places by military force. The bishop and those sent by him are forbidden the use of their jurisdiction, and parishes punished for receiving him solemnly. Prohibitions have been issued against missions, spiritual exercises, the publication of the jubilee, and even the devotions of the Month of Mary, and in "free Switzerland" heavy fines are inflicted on men and women for the sole offence of practising their devotions or singing Catholic hymns in their own houses.

The Swiss Catholic bishops have, within the period named, memorialized the Swiss Federal Assembly against the many laws passed to persecute and oppress the Catholic Church.

The repeated and imploring appeals of clergy and people to the Federal Assembly against these laws have been utterly in vain. They have been supplemented by further decrees for the suppression of episcopal jurisdiction within the canton. The Swiss bishops in their memorial recall the days of the Catacombs, and declare that the sad scenes of the early Church are renewed among the priests and the faithful of the canton Ticino. All intercourse with their lawful pastors is prohibited under pains and penalties, and has to be carried on in secret, and yet Mr. Cooke tells us that Switzerland is a country of religious freedom.

It is impossible to present here all the details of the vexations and insolent persecutions against which the bishops raise their

voice. A few examples must suffice. In the canton of Aargau the use of the Catechism approved by the bishop has been forbidden. The well-known Bible History of Schuster, used throughout a large part of Europe in various languages, fared no better. These insolent, meddling legislators, probably most of them unbelievers, forbade its use, and had another drawn up. Among a host of smaller vexations may be named ridiculous orders issued to the clergy, as to the length of their sermons, and prohibition to take part in any religious ceremony in a neighboring diocese.

A far more serious assault on the Catholic Church in Switzerland is the interference with the training and education of the clergy over which the state has asserted the most arbitrary control, regulating the examinations and rejecting candidates for the priesthood at its own pleasure. The state even suppressed the theological seminary of Aargau because the bishop would not accept the text-books at the dictation of the civil authorities.

A few more of the decrees affecting religion in Mr. Cooke's land of religious freedom may be given. All elections to benefices are subject to the civil authorities. No priest is permitted to perform any functions of his office, even temporarily, without permission of the government.

Already in several cantons civil marriage is obligatory, and by a refinement of insolence the parish priest is required, under heavy penalties, to proclaim it in his own church. In Thurgau the Catholic schools have been entirely suppressed. The suppression of religious houses and the confiscation of their property to the state has gone on steadily. The bishops give a long, sad list of these sacrileges, many of the decrees bearing date so late as 1869 and 1870.

Such facts give us a glimpse of a state of things certainly worse in some respects than the more violent persecutions of early Christian times. And in view of these facts what shall we think of Mr. Cooke's assertions that in Switzerland "religious freedom is the law in all the cantons"? It certainly is the height of presumption for Mr. Cooke, in this amazing state of ignorance, to play the critic and correct the Catholic text-book writer. R. J. J.

This assertion of Mr. Cooke has no warrant in history. If the charter of Maryland had secured religious toleration, which as a matter of fact it did not, Lord Baltimore was undoubtedly the author of it, and he was a devout Catholic. If Mr. Cooke, therefore, contrary to all historical evidence, insists on believing that it was all due to the charter that religious toleration prevailed in the colony of Maryland, then, as the charter was a document wholly of Catholic authorship, the credit belongs none the less to Catholics. Lord Baltimore's authorship of the charter is not in doubt. The Protestant historians Bozman and Rev. Ethan Allen both concede that Lord Baltimore prepared the charter. On the other hand, putting Mr. Cooke's unsupported say-so on one side, and accepting history as it is, we find that from the moment the charter was granted, though religious toleration was not mentioned in it, the Catholic colonists who settled Maryland, led by the noble Sir George Calvert, practised the broadest toleration toward all the Christian sects. Bancroft, Griffith, Chambers, Kent, and Story, all recognize this fact and eulogize them for it. If the charter itself secured religious toleration, why should these eminent authors, two of them among the foremost lawyers the country has produced, praise the Maryland colonists for proclaiming and practising a toleration which they were powerless to avoid? "Religious freedom," says Bancroft, "had ever been sacred on their soil." Judge Story declares of Lord Baltimore that he "introduced into his fundamental policy the doctrine of general toleration and equality among Christian sects." The Catholic colonists from the outset allowed Protestants to settle among them, erect their own chapel, and enjoy their own order of worship. They gave a broad invitation to the Puritans of Massachusetts to come and reside with them, and Lord Baltimore even went so far as to appoint a Protestant governor, Col. Stone, over the colony. And in 1649 they passed the Toleration Act, not to inaugurate toleration, but to confirm what they had practised all along. Mr. Davis, a Protestant writer, says of this Act of 1649:

"The toleration which prevailed from the first, and for fifteen years later, was formally ratified by the voice of the people."

John Esten Cooke, in his history of Virginia ("The American Commonwealths" series, pages 210 and 211), says:

"The truth is that the Roman Catholics of Maryland were the only tolerant people of that frightfully intolerant age. The governor, it has been seen, was forced to swear that he 'would not molest any person believing in Jesus Christ, for or in respect of religion.' But their toleration was accounted to them for a crime. The Puritan party were their sworn foes, and candid Mr. Bancroft says, 'had neither the gratitude to respect the rights of the government by which they had been received and fostered, nor magnanimity to continue the toleration to which alone they were indebted for their residence in the colony'; for the furthest reach of their toleration when they came into power was to 'confirm the freedom of conscience, provided the liberty were not extended to '*popery, prelacy, or licentiousness of opinion!*' One reads this grim piece of humor with a queer sensation. There should be perfect freedom of religion — except for Catholics, Church of England people, and others who differed with themselves in theology!"

Mr. George W. Cooke tells us that the Protestants owed nothing in Maryland to the first Catholic colonists, because their rights were secured to them by the charter, but Mr. John Esten Cooke demolishes this fiction (page 211) by saying:

"The truth seems to be perfectly plain. The Catholics were in their right, and Clayborne and the rest were not. Neither the famous rebel, nor the Protestants of any description had any rights in Maryland save what were granted them by the Catholics. What they acquired beyond this they acquired by force."

Again (page 181) this writer says:

"Never was social fabric established on a larger or more liberal foundation than that of Maryland. All sects were protected, and the very oath of the governor was, 'I will not, by myself or any other, directly or indirectly *molest any person professing to believe in Jesus Christ, for or in respect of religion.*' This had naturally attracted the Puritans, both of New England and Virginia; and their first act in Maryland was to come to blows with their hosts."

And the same Protestant author (page 214), writing of the Puritans' violation of the tolerance shown them in Maryland, and their successful armed attack on the Catholic people of the colony, says further:

"Maryland now belonged to the Puritans, and as the age was matter-of-fact, and opposition to the strongest was necessarily

treason, the Catholic leaders were sentenced to death, and four of them were then and there executed. Stone's life was only saved by the intercession of some personal friends. As to the 'Jesuit Fathers,' we are told that they were 'hotly pursued and escaped to Virginia where they inhabited a mean low hut,' — which seems to have been a pleasant reflection."

William Hand Browne, of Johns Hopkins University, in his "History of Maryland" (page 45), bears similar testimony. He says:

"While as yet there was no spot in Christendom where religious belief was free, and when even the Commons of England had openly declared against toleration, he (Lord Baltimore) founded a community wherein no man was to be molested for his faith. At a time when absolutism had struck down representative government in England, and it was doubtful if a Parliament of freemen would ever meet again, he founded a community in which no laws were to be made without the consent of the freemen. The Ark and the Dove were names of happy omen: the one saved from the general wreck the germs of political liberty, and the other bore the olive branch of religious peace."

Describing in the same work (pages 79 and 80) the strongly contrasting intolerance shown by the Puritans when they obtained, by force, temporary control of the colony, this writer says:

"The commissioners now went to work and issued writs of election to a General Assembly, writs of a tenor hitherto unknown in Maryland. No man of the Roman Catholic faith could be elected as a burgess, or even cast a vote. The Assembly obtained by this process of selection justified its choice. It at once repealed the Toleration Act of 1649, and enacted a new one more to its mind, which also bore the title, 'An Act Concerning Religion"; but it was toleration with a difference. It provided that none who professed the Popish religion could be protected in the Province, but were to be restrained from the exercise thereof. For Protestants it provided that no one professing faith in Christ was to be restrained from the exercise of his religion, 'provided that this liberty be not extended to popery or prelacy [meaning the Church of England], nor to such as under the profession of Christ hold forth and practise licentiousness.' That is, with the exception of the Roman Catholics and the Churchmen, together with the Brownists, Quakers and Anabaptists, and other miscellaneous Protestant sects aimed at by the third exclusion, all others might profess their faith without molestation. Surely this toleration might have been expressed in briefer phrase."

Summing up the whole of the early history of religious toleration and lack of toleration in the colony, the same author (page 185) says:

"We may now place side by side the three tolerations of Maryland. The toleration of the Proprietaries (the Catholic founders) lasted fifty years, and under it all believers in Christ were equal before the law, and all support to churches or ministers was voluntary; the Puritan toleration lasted six years, and included all but Papists, Prelatists (Episcopalians), and those who held objectionable doctrines; the Anglican toleration lasted eighty years, and had glebes (lands) and churches for the establishment, connivance for Dissenters, the penal law for Catholics, and for all the forty per poll (*i. e.* forty pounds of tobacco per poll were levied for the support of the Anglican church and clergy)."

"It is a striking and instructive spectacle to behold, at this period," says Prof. Walters, of Philadelphia, "the Puritans persecuting their Protestant brethren in New England, the Episcopalians retorting the same severity on the Puritans in Virginia, and the Catholics, against whom all others were combined, forming in Maryland a sanctuary where all might worship, and none might oppress, and where even Protestants might find refuge from Protestant intolerance." "Yet these very men," he adds, "with ingratitude still more odious than their injustice, projected the abrogation not only of the Catholic worship, but of every part of that system of toleration under whose shelter they were enabled to conspire its downfall." — *Marshall.*

The Protestant colonists of Maryland have themselves left us the most conclusive testimony to the tolerant policy of the Catholic founders in the document known as the Protestant Declaration, made in April, 1650, just after Lord Baltimore had signed the Toleration Act. This document, signed by the Protestant Governor Stone, several Protestant privy councillors, and all the Protestant members of the Assembly of 1650, as well as by a large number of other Protestants in the colony, was addressed to Lord Baltimore, and expressed to him the gratitude they felt for the fact that — in their own words — they enjoyed "all fitting and convenient freedom and liberty in the exercise of our (their) religion under his lordship's government and interest." This furnishes the best of proof, the direct declaration of the Protestant colonists themselves, publicly made at the time, that it was not to the charter nor solely to the Act of 1649, but to the uniformly broad and

tolerant policy of Lord Baltimore and the Catholic founders, that they were indebted for religious freedom, and that the political power of the colony was in Catholic hands. Indeed, as proprietor of the entire landed estate of the colony, Lord Baltimore absolutely controlled its entire policy. If he had chosen to withhold grants of land from all except Catholic settlers, it was within his power to have done so, thus excluding non-Catholics of every sect from obtaining a foothold there. Without his consent no church or chapel could have been erected, for the land on which to build it could not have been obtained.

The testimony is overwhelming that the Catholic founders of Maryland were a tolerant people, and that, of their own voluntary motion, they showed the largest liberality towards all Christian denominations. When, later on, the Puritan gained the ascendancy, Catholics were proscribed and persecuted. Still later again, when the Catholics once more held the stronger hand, toleration for all Christians was once more established and maintained. Clearly the charter did not secure religious toleration, or else these fluctuations from tolerance to persecution could not have been recorded. Mr. Cooke cannot put the allegations of his no-Popery leaflets in the place of history and deny to the Catholics of Maryland the honor which reputable historians have agreed in giving them.

R. J. J.

WHAT CATHOLICS HAVE DONE FOR SCIENCE.

With regard to the Reformation and its influence on civilization, there are, of course, two differing views, the Catholic and the Protestant view. As Mr. Cooke has quoted Erasmus as the "greatest scholar of the Reformation period and as sometimes in sympathy with the reformers," Erasmus certainly should know what the Reformation did for letters and art. Yet Dr. Schaff, in his "History of the Christian Church," written from the Protestant stand-point, quotes Erasmus as saying "that he regarded the Reformation as a public calamity, which brought ruin to arts and letters, and anarchy to the Church." (Vol. VI., page 423.) Mr. Cooke's assertion that the Catholic Church has been the enemy of civilization and progress would be surprising, if it did not come from a man who has offered to substantiate every word contained

in Swinton's "Outlines" by a consensus of unbiased historians, and who does not know the difference between the Inquisition and an indulgence. This strange jumbling of ideas is painfully apparent in Mr. Cooke's letter (pages 67 and 78, *supra*), where Mr. Cooke, having started out to vindicate Swinton's interpretation of the teachings and practice of the Catholic Church in the matter of indulgences, quotes, on page 67, the *Congregationalist's* opinion of what Swinton says about the Inquisition, and evidently quotes it in the evident belief that an opinion bearing on the Inquisition applies equally well to an indulgence. With the same hopeless confusion of ideas Mr. Cooke elsewhere (page 78) writes about indulgences and absolution, as though they were identical things; for in order to support his view of indulgences, he quotes what Motley says about absolution. So ill informed a man would naturally be the one to describe the Catholic Church as the enemy of liberty and civilization, when in truth mankind is profoundly indebted to her for both. It would, as a matter of fact, be more difficult to tell what the Church has not done for the cultivation of art, literature, and science, than to describe what she has done. The clamors of vulgar prejudice have represented the Catholic Church as inimical to the progress of these things, but I think authentic history will show that many of the greatest masterpieces in every department of literature and art have been directly produced under her inspiration and guardianship.

"The children of the Church were the pioneers of every branch of science. The greatest names in astronomy, mathematics, mechanics, electricity, galvanism, chemistry, optics, thermotics, mineralogy, and botany are Catholic ones. Yes, every branch of modern science owes, not only its origin, but the main part of its growth, to Catholic scientists, so that it can be said with sincerest truth that the sceptre of science belongs to the Church." — *Brennan's "What Catholics Have Done for Science."*

INDEX

PAGE

Introductory Remarks 1

A Sectarian Text-Book; Letter of the Rev. R. J. Johnson, showing Swinton's "Outlines of the World's History" to be Sectarian, by Protestant Authorities 16

"Catholic Doctrine Caricatured"; Second Letter of the Rev. R. J. Johnson, showing how Swinton distorts the Doctrine of Indulgences as defined by the Church; the Opinions of leading Protestant Newspapers 23

"Swinton's Inaccuracies"; Third Letter of the Rev. R. J. Johnson; the Merits of Swinton's "Outlines" as an Elementary Text-Book; Gen. U. S. Grant's Opinion of Swinton 31

Letter of the Rev. George W. Cooke on Swinton's History; he declares that "a Consensus of Unbiased Historians will substantiate every word contained in Swinton's History" 40

"The Catholic Position"; Letter of the Rev. R. J. Johnson; Differences of Fact and Opinion; a Balancing of Authorities 45

A Defence of Swinton; Letter of the Rev. George W. Cooke . 58

The Defence of Swinton continued by the Rev. George W. Cooke 69

Third Letter in Defence of Swinton by Rev. Mr. Cooke . . 80

The Rev. R. J. Johnson replies to the Rev. Mr. Cooke; the Truth about Indulgences; the Catholic Church never taught that they were Pardons of Guilt or Licenses to commit Sin 86

Letter of the Rev. George W. Cooke on "The Facts about Swinton's History" 98

Letter of the Rev. George W. Cooke on "Catholic Misrepresentations of Protestantism" 106

The Rev. George W. Cooke's Letters reviewed by the Rev. R. J. Johnson; Mr. Cooke's Promise to substantiate every Word in Swinton's Text-Book not fulfilled 113
Other Authorities cited by the Rev. George W. Cooke examined by Rev. R. J. Johnson; Vicar-General Byrne's Views distorted; the *Christian Union's* Opinion 120
Letter of the Rev. George W. Cooke; the Attitude of the Catholic Church towards the Public Schools . . . 131
Popular Errors concerning Indulgences pointed out by the Rev. R. J. Johnson; Indulgences are not under the Control of the Priesthood and cannot be used as a Lever for gaining Money; Motley's and Robertson's Standing as Unbiased Historians 139
Travellers' Tales; Letter of the Rev. R. J. Johnson showing how Scandalous Stories about the Catholic Church and Clergy are sent from Europe 151
Some Side Issues; Letter of the Rev. R. J. Johnson on Parochial School Books and their Critics; a Glance at Mr. Edwin D. Mead's Pamphlet 161
A Last Rejoinder from the Rev. Geo. W. Cooke . . . 168
Bearing False Witness; Closing Letter of the Rev. R. J. Johnson; Mr. Cooke's Alleged Quotations from the Pope's Encyclical Letter and from other Catholic Authorities shown not to be Genuine; Mr. Cooke directly challenged to prove them 170

APPENDIX.

"A Plea for Toleration"; a Dispassionate Review of the School Controversy by Mr. Henry Winn. Reprinted from the Boston *Herald* 183
Swinton's "Outlines" reviewed by Mr. Alpha Child, of Watertown, N. Y.; its Glaring Errors exposed by a Protestant Critic. Reprinted from the Boston *Transcript* . . . 192
"The Teaching of History"; an Editorial reprinted from the *Christian Register* 201
The Doctrine of Indulgences; Extract from an Editorial reprinted from the Boston *Advertiser* 208
"Indulgences Again"; an Editorial reprinted from the Boston *Advertiser* 209

The Public-School Question; a Paper by Prof. Charles Kendall Adams 212
Catholic Indian Missions; the Rev. George W. Cooke's Aspersions upon a Catholic Text-Book shown to be unfounded . 219
Catholic Aid to American Independence; a Reply to Mr. Cooke's Objections to a Statement in Sadlier's History . 222
Oppression of the Catholic Church in Switzerland; another of Mr. Cooke's Criticisms answered 226
Toleration in Maryland; how Lord Baltimore and the Catholic Founders of Maryland set the Example of Civil and Religious Liberty on this Continent 228
What Catholics have done for Science; a Vulgar Prejudice corrected 232

B.P.L. Bindery.
OCT 9 1901